FORUM

Copyright 1946, by The Events Publishing Co.

Vol. CV FEBRUARY, 1946 No. 2

The second in a series on "What is the Matter With Us?"

The State and the Family

By Theodore M. Greene

Visiting Professor of Philosophy, Stanford University

MANY people will be surprised and shocked by the statement that, of all our social institutions, only the school and the church have inner cultural and spiritual resources, and that the state and the family are both, in this respect, derivative and secondary. I believe that this statement is true, but it certainly needs to be explained and justified.

The state and the family are at least as influential in our society as the church and the school. Their influence is so great that many people are tempted today to base their hopes for our future primarily upon these institutions, rather than upon education or religious salvation. Yet if state and family are not culturally and spiritually independent and capable of criticizing and re-vitalizing themselves, undue reliance on them is dangerous and may be tragic. Let us consider their nature in this respect.

State and federal legislation exercises extensive control over all other institutional activities and, directly and indirectly, affects the life of every individual citizen in innumerable ways. It also crystalizes public opinion on many social and international issues, and it sometimes expresses, in laws inspired by statesmanlike vision, a social consciousness and a wisdom in advance of average public opinion. The influence of the state is thus partly preventative, partly conservative and partly progressive. It checks various antisocial activities that the majority condemns; it enforces various practices which are sanctioned by current conceptions of justice and fair play; and it is capable of raising the sights of the average citizen by legalizing some of the ideals of a more enlightened minority.

It is also possible for the state to set up machinery for political self-examination and self-criticism. It can assure opportunity for free debate before the enactment of legislation. It can defend the rights of minority groups and encourage the destructive and constructive criticism of such groups. The government can keep the public informed of its problems, publicize its project-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed solutions of them, and take cognizance of the public's immediate needs and ideal aspirations. Similarly, in the enforcement of laws which have been enacted, it can see to it that both the claims and the rights of the defendant are fully respected, that no one is imprisoned illegally or unjustifiably, and that the average man's sense of justice is allowed to express itself, as, for example, in trial by jury. What we loosely call the state, therefore, is by no means a blind machine or an inhuman mechanical social process. It is rather a vast dynamic human institution with tremendous educational as well as coercive influence.

Whence, however, does the state derive whatever wisdom it is able to exhibit? When legislation is enlightened, where does this enlightenment ultimately come from? When laws are justly and mercifully administered, what is the source of this sense of justice and human compassion? If a statesman, in contrast to a mere politician, is defined as a man who combines real social vision with the factual knowledge and the understanding of human nature requisite to the translation of this vision into historical actuality, where does he get this vision, this sense of human values, this sensitive social conscientiousness? Not primarily from the study of law, however necessary and illuminating such study may be. Not merely from a survey of history, though only through a knowledge of history can he hope to escape political naïveté. And not even from active participation in practical politics, though such participation is certainly essential for an understanding of political forces and tendencies, tactics and strategy, and of human nature as it reveals itself in the political arena.

No! Political wisdom, in the full meaning of that term, is merely human wisdom applied in the realm of public affairs. Its values are human values in the political setting. Its statesmen—and every society has many politicians and very few real statesmen—are wise men in public life who have acquired their wisdom not primarily from the study and practice of law or politics, but from extra-political and extra-legal sources. They have got it from other wise men, past and present, and these, in turn, have usually been the prophets and seers, philosophers and saints, artists and scientists and reformers—some contemporary, but most of them of other generations and epochs and even cultures. And this wisdom has been made available to our great statesmen in and through our own cultural and spiritual heritage and that of other cultures.

SOCIETY'S WISDOM

The same is true of whatever social and political wisdom our society as a whole may possess. A society is as wise as its tradition and as vital as the institutions whose function it is to safeguard past wisdom and foster fresh insights. It is wise in proportion as it has learned, tested and put to use what the unusual man has discovered and made available, in some form or other, to his fellows.

In the long run, a society gets the laws and the political machinery which it demands and deserves. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sufficiently ardent passion for political liberty will finally bring into being the political and legal devices which will safeguard and foster such liberty. A sufficiently wide-spread and deeply rooted craving for a paternalistic government, coupled with a sufficiently compulsive disinclination on the part of most people to assume and exercise political responsibility, will either prevent the development of democratic control and initiative or, if these are already present, encourage their misuse or neglect. But whence come the aspirations and inertias of a society? Whence the ideals of responsible initiative and social responsibility, of liberty, social justice and international cooperation? And whence comes our political irresponsibility and lethargy, our "rugged individualism" and our craving for paternalistic care, our callousness to social injustice, nationalistic pride and isolationist blindness? What makes a society more or less infantile or mature, socially sensitive or insensitive, blind and cruel or wise and gentle and just? Its laws and political machinery are indeed powerful moulding forces, but people can't be legislated into moral responsibility or endowed with a sense of human dignity and value by mere political organization. Whatever social conscience and political wisdom a society possesses will indeed express itself legally and politically, but this conscience and this wisdom must be derived ultimately from non-political and non-legal sources.

In short, the state as such does not have, in its own political and legal framework, the cultural and spiritual resources upon which it can draw to vitalize or re-vitalize itself in the direction of genuine human progress. Even the self-criticism which it can foster must finally be based on standards and ideals which have originated elsewhere, in other institutions and in individual insights of another order.

FAMILY'S POSITION

The family is in much the same predicament. It is in significant ways the same kind of organization as the state. From the point of view of the individual, the state is a huge, loosely knit, all-embracing macrocosm; the family is a small intimate microcosm. The state controls our adult lives in its cumbersome, wholesale many-sided fashion; the family moulds us in childhood in countless personal ways. The control of the state persists throughout our lives, but it is less intense and concentrated than that of the family. The family's influence diminishes rapidly after adolescence, but it is dominant and all-pervasive during the impressionable years of infancy and childhood. The family and the state are thus two institutions which affect our lives profoundly, the one more intensely, briefly and personally, the other more extensively, continuously and impersonally.

The influence of the family, like that of the state, is as good or as bad as are the parents. The family has been the occasion of more misery and happiness, perversion and healthy growth, cruelty and love, than any other institution save only the church. Though the hold of the family on the growing boy and girl

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has certainly diminished in recent decades, particularly in urban areas, its dominant role during childhood continues and will continue as long as the family system in anything like its present form persists. But sentimentalists keep assuming, in the face of all contrary evidence, that the influence of the family is overwhelmingly beneficent and that it promotes far more happiness and welfare than unhappiness and harm. They close their eyes to the innumerable instances of conjugal, parental and filial misery and frustration, and they forget how very difficult it is for human beings to realize in their own lives the highest demands and rewards of love.

These demands and rewards can perhaps best be understood in terms of the various levels on which human beings can associate with one another in the intimacy of family life, the natural hierarchy of these levels, and the proper role of each in family life at its best. This is an ancient tale, and one which should be far more familiar than it seems to be.

The lowest and most primitive level is, of course, the purely physical —the satisfaction of man's normal sexual and other animal appetites. One of the few ways in which we are undoubtedly ahead of the Victorians is in the relatively widespread recognition that sex is not in itself dirty or shameful, and that the more we know about the sexual needs of both men and women the better. The medical profession has done us a very great service on this score, though many young people, married and unmarried, are still far too uninformed and naïve on sexual and related matters.

Love at this lowest level is labelled lust, and lust has a bad connotation because it signifies mere animal gratification and nothing more. But just as eating is transformed by good company and conversation into a significant and delightful human rite — a rite which, be it noted in passing, whets rather than dulls the appetite for food and drink —so does sex take on a new and genuinely human character in the context of romantic love. It is the fashion today in sophisticated circles to speak scornfully of romantic love. This scorn is of course justified if it is directed against the assumption, held by so many younger and older people today and fostered so assiduously by Hollywood, that romantic love is the quintessence of human love at its best. It is certainly not that, but neither is it in itself any more deplorable than is sexual gratification. It is the first, completely natural and normally adolescent attempt to humanize sex by putting it in an attractive psychological and physical setting. The sexual impulse is its base, but it raises the lover above this base by enabling him to regard his beloved with a tenderness which sex alone seldom occasions. The scenic, poetical, musical and domestic expressions of this tenderness are no doubt sentimental, but their sentimentality marks an important stage above the merely animal to which mere animals cannot consciously aspire.

The limitations of romantic love, however, are, or should be, clearly evident to all except the romantic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lovers themselves. For such love is notoriously blind. It is blind not only in leading the lover to endow his beloved with many desired characteristics which she does not possess. (This type of blindness is unfortunate chiefly because it is so quickly followed by a disillusioning clarity of vision and often by a resultant cynicism.) It is also, and far more seriously, blind in that the lover is unable to apprehend his beloved's deepest needs and aspirations. That is, it is usually unaccompanied by significant moral insight in the widest sense. This failure frequently expresses itself in ignorance, evasion or open defiance of social conventions and taboos.

Such non-conformity need not, of course, be immoral; all the great prophets and moralists have criticized the social conventions of their times. But they have done so in order to rise above them and improve them, not to fall below them into undisciplined license. Romantic non-conformity is often immoral and dangerous because it grows out of an unawareness of the positive wisdom which successive generations have acquired and preserved in the relatively rigid forms of social conventions and prohibitions. Rebellious lovers thus tend to fall, consciously or unconsciously, below the level of conventional morality, through sheer animal impulse, ignorance, sentimentality or adolescent perversity. When they do so they have to pay the price which society exacts of them if they are found out, and whether they are found out or not they inevitably pay the price of defying the basic laws of human personality and growth which are, however crudely, recorded in social conventions.

As the young couple becomes established in its own home and the children begin to arrive, romantic love tends to give way rapidly, often too rapidly, to a working relationship that is partly a business partnership, partly a deepening companionship and partly a sharing of family and social responsibilities at a higher moral level. It is at this stage that conjugal loyalty, parental affection and, presently, filial devotion make their appearance. Each of us knows many families in which the parents and children exhibit these traits. It is these husbands, wives and children who are most respected by the most solid and respectable members of our society, and it is such families as these that contribute much of the vigor and stability of our society.

Yet love at this level too can, and often does, become malignant by becoming egoistic and possessive. The love of one human being for another is most perfect when it is most selfless, most unpossessive, most nearly an absorption in the welfare and happiness of the person loved. Such love as this is as rare as it is difficult, particularly at the post-romantic stage of stolid family life. One of the endearing characteristics of romantic love at its best is the genuine unselfishness, however blind and uninformed, which it frequently exhibits. The romantic lover is more likely to be really concerned with his beloved's welfare than are the husband or wife who have been married several years and who have come to take each other for granted. The challenge to mature family love

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to this transcendence of self, not in the heat of sexual passion or the haze of romantic adoration, but in the sober yet inspired understanding of husband and wife, child and parent, as human beings of intrinsic value and dignity. This challenge has clearly not been met by a fond mother who is forever talking about what "my boy" does or does not do —that "my" usually betrays her possessiveness, her love of John not primarily as a free moral agent but as *her* son. The curse of family life in its conventionally successful manifestations is this possessiveness of husbands towards their wives, wives towards their husbands, parents towards their children and, quite as frequently though more excusably, children towards their parents.

FAMILY ISOLATION

Even love in its most unpossessive forms, however, is not the best that man can achieve, nor can man escape possessiveness in love by a mere act of will. It is a curious but inescapable fact about human beings that they can love each other most when they love something else even more. The great danger of family life when family love is strongest is its tendency to familial isolationism and to loyalties restricted to the family group. For such restriction fosters intra-familial idolatry which, in turn, results in a weakening of more inclusive interests and in the frustration of social, intellectual and spiritual growth. This can be demonstrated in many ways. The wife who lives too exclusively for her husband and children is not only doomed to love them possessively and harmfully; she becomes increasingly unable to provide them with the companionship which, as human beings, they most crave. Husbands are often protected from this vice by their professional interests and duties. Their problem is rather to acquire and preserve a respect for their work which is rooted in the conviction that it is not merely lucrative but socially useful. Ideally, the parents' richest gift to each other and to their children is a genuine devotion to mankind which expresses itself concretely in whatever ways are most appropriate to their respective talents. Full realization of this ideal is the cure, and the only cure, for possessive love; it is also the only means whereby the love of the members of a family for one another can reach its highest human level.

This is as far as the strict humanist can go. Those whose religious faith is both sincere and informed will insist that there is one more stage in the dialectic of human love, the stage, namely, at which man's love for his fellow man is set in the context of a higher and even more compelling love for a Deity worthy of such love. Thus, Christianity declares man's inability to escape idolatry save through belief in the one true God, and his certain failure to transcend a possessive love unless he accepts the assistance which the Christian Gospel proclaims. In this perspective, the highest Christian love is possible only in a truly Christian home in which all family and social loyalties are subsumed under, and conceived of as corollaries to, God's love for man and man's responding love for God.

For the Christian, as I interpret

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christianity, there is no conflict between these levels of human love, provided the hierarchy of levels is not forgotten. Christianity teaches that we can love each other more, not less, if we love God as He should be loved; that love of mankind, in turn, is fostered and not hindered by family affection of the right type; and this affection is not hostile either to romantic love or to sexual satisfaction, if the former develops into mature human affection and if the latter is not allowed to lapse into sheer animality. The conscientious humanist will be compelled to reject religious beliefs and practices, at least for himself, but he too can recognize the ascending scale of the remaining levels.

I have analyzed love and the family at such length in order to explain what I meant by describing the family as a secondary or derivative institution without inner cultural or spiritual resources. Is it not clear that the life of any specific family is bound to be whatever the parents make it, and that they will be able to achieve in this respect only what they have learned through contact with institutions and individuals outside the family circle? True, parents have learned much, as children, from their parents, and so on back and back through the generations. But at each stage the wisdom of the parents—their knowledge of the human body, their capacity in youth for romantic love, their later capacity for responsible family loyalty and cooperation, and finally their ability to transcend possessiveness and idolatry—this wisdom *must* depend upon their immediate social environment and hence upon the individuals and institutions, past and present, that have made this environment what it is.

What chance have parents who have no knowledge of the body and its needs to achieve a normal sexual life even at the purely physical level, to instruct their children wisely on matters of sex? How can young people experience romantic love if their imaginations have not been tutored in the moods and devices of romance? How can fidelity, tenderness and responsibility be expected of a couple which has never encountered these traits and is wholly ignorant of them? And how can familial provincialism be transcended save as more universal loyalties, secular or religious, are elicited by the society in which the family finds itself? If the parents are uneducated their family life will be illiterate and inarticulate. If they know nothing of religion their perspective must necessarily be secular. In short, our families are what our societies make them.

If this analysis, however sketchy, is correct in its main tenets, we are compelled to turn to the school and the church as the two major institutions in our society which have in the past exhibited great inner resources and upon which we must depend in the predictable future unless we are to abandon all hope for our culture. I shall examine these two institutions more closely in the following articles.

• A fanatic is a person who is highly enthusiastic about something in which you are not even remotely interested. —*Successful Farming*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"What Europe needs is more production, not more poverty"

The Potsdam Policies

By Ferdinand A. Hermens

Professor of Political Science, Notre Dame University

THE economic program contained in the Potsdam declarations admittedly places a heavy burden upon the people of Germany, upon their neighbors and, to a lesser extent, upon the rest of the world. We are told that the burden has to be borne if we are to have peace. But what if the result is more likely to be war than peace?

This is a momentous question. It should have been thoroughly debated by the people of America, and in particular by the Congress which they have elected. There is a congressional committee which deals with the general problem: a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, headed by Senator Kilgore. There have appeared before this committee a number of witnesses from executive agencies. They came to testify on behalf of the policies of which Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., has, for some time, been the best-known advocate. They could not have done otherwise. There is no lack of experts in the respective government departments who consider the testimony misleading and the committee's conclusions faulty. They can, and do, write critical briefs which their superiors gravely acknowledge—and file away. They can, and do, present their views orally in staff meetings. They are not, and cannot be, heard before the Kilgore committee or any other committee. For there is a law which states that testimony by government officials has to be cleared by an agency connected with the Bureau of the Budget. It will be disallowed if it fails to agree with the policies of the department, or of the President. Mr. Morgenthau, in his book, *Germany Is Our Problem,* advises us that, from the time of the Quebec conference, "the basic principles of the program (the 'Morgenthau plan') have represented the official position of the United States government." This means in practice that, ever since September, 1944, testimony of government experts not in agreement with Mr. Morgenthau's policies has been impossible. Outsiders, of course, might have been heard, and this would have provided a chance to equalize the scales. A request for such hearings was made, however, and rejected.

Recent discussions have raised serious doubts that Potsdam represents either an acceptable or a workable solution for the problems of Germany and the peace. *The Christian Century,* for example, has published two editorials entitled "Are We Murderers?" and "Potsdam Must Go." Such criticism appears to be mounting rather than subsid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing. The issue remains undecided, therefore, and if a definite policy is to be adopted a thorough and impartial investigation of the subject is imperative.

In the first place, it must be emphasized that where, in the opinion of Mr. Morgenthau and his followers, only the economist has to be consulted, the historian and the political scientist have also a few questions to ask. The historian will remember that peace-makers are inveterate specialists in the art of solving the problems of yesterday. If a certain country was our enemy in the past, does it follow that it will be our enemy in the future? In John Richard Green's *History of the English People* there is this to be read about the younger Pitt: "When Fox taunted him with forgetting Chatham's jealousie of France and his faith that she was the natural enemy of England, Pitt answered nobly that 'to suppose any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish'." At this time we can hardly conceive of England and France fighting another war against each other. English and American conflicts with Germany have been of relatively recent date, and what reason do we have to assume that they will continue indefinitely?

The historian will further be entitled to ask a question concerning the arrangements for the security of western Europe against Germany made in 1919. Those arrangements included the demilitarization of the Rhineland. A few years ago, before war-time passions had reached their peak, Professor Paul Birdsall (in his book, *Versailles Twenty Years After*) had this to say about the reoccupation of that province by Hitler in 1936:

> "When Hitler himself accepted Locarno as valid, and subsequently denounced the pact, he provided the French and British with the soundest legal and moral case for action—and we now know that action would have been effective without a struggle. That the two governments declined to act,—with consequences disastrous to themselves, — is no criticism of the Rhineland provisions which they refused to enforce. Subsequent history has demonstrated, not disproved, the adequacy of those provisions for French security."

The Germany of the future, submitted by Hitler to a blood-letting unknown to any other people in modern history, will be weaker than the Germany of 1936. Are we still afraid? A policy motivated by fear is likely to develop in the long run the very conditions against which it seeks to prevail!

So much for the historian. The political scientist can simplify his task by turning for guidance to the great storehouse of wisdom accumulated by the Founders of the American Republic. There is Tom Paine who said: "Man is not the enemy of man, but through the medium of a false system of government." Germany, in recent history, has suffered not from one but from two false systems of government. According to Winston Churchill, the "German problem" consisted of a combination of militarism and tyranny.

So far as militarism is concerned, its causes as well as its cure have been lucidly discussed by Jay and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hamilton in Numbers 5-8 of the Federalist papers. Militarism, they say, is born out of insecurity. A spirit of jealousy and distrust, at times inflamed by border incidents, easily develops among countries living in complete independence on the same continent. Alliances and counter-alliances will be concluded, and standing armies will be established. The officer corps forming the backbone of such armies will feel that their function is more vital than that of the civilians. Besides, as Montesquieu told us, they will look down upon civilians as mere "talkers" whereas they consider themselves "men of action." Thus, a feeling of superiority will arise, and since they have the means of overcoming resistance they will, in the end, rule their country. When that point is reached liberty will vanish, and war is in the offing.

Such consequences, Jay and Hamilton argue, cannot be eliminated unless we attack their causes. Therefore, establish security on the basis of a federation and there will be no need for oversized armies, nor a chance for them to suppress liberty and endanger peace. This is the solution which was tried on this side of the Atlantic, and which has now a successful record of more than a century and a half. If we could apply this remedy to Europe, it would mean that the danger not only of German, but of any other kind of militarism, would be forestalled. The difficulties confronting the attainment of a "Europe Free and United"—to use the title of Albert Guérard's sane and brilliant book—are great. But we might well promote all steps leading in that general direction. It is vital to bear in mind that any attempt to establish the security of any one country in Europe at the expense of other countries only serves to aggravate and perpetuate existing divisions. And it is pertinent to recall that a federated Europe was a demand by *all* the underground movements which grew out of Nazi oppression.

In this connection the question will be asked how a federated Europe can work if in Germany (or in Italy, for that matter) there should be another failure of what Paine considered the "true form of government" (namely, a representative democracy), and the rise of new tyrannies. This question has many facets. Montesquieu said, however, that the law of elections was "the fundamental law" in a republic, as important as the law governing the succession to the throne in a monarchy. Both Italy and Germany held their elections under proportional representation. When Thomas Hare first presented that system of voting to the English public, Walter Bagehot, in his classic, *The English Constitution,* had this to say:

". . . the mass of a Parliament ought to be men of moderate sentiments or they will elect an immoderate ministry, and enact violent laws. But upon the plan suggested, the House would be made up of party politicians selected by a party committee, chained to that committee and pledged to party violence, and of characteristic, and therefore immoderate representatives, for every 'ism' in all England. Instead of a deliberate assembly of moderate and judi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cious men, we should have a various compound of all sorts of violence."

The German parliaments preceding the rise of Hitler represented every "ism" in all Germany, and government by a coherent majority became impossible under such conditions. Alexander Hamilton was aware of the inevitable reaction to a situation in which democratic "liberty" leads to complete corrosion of authority. As he said before the New York Ratifying Convention: "That the human passions should flow from one extreme to another is, I allow, natural. Hence the mad project of creating a dictator." The iron "order" of dictatorship, indeed, is liable to follow upon the disorders of an unmanageable democracy.

ECONOMIST'S VIEW

Let us now turn to the economist's conception of the Potsdam proposals. Mr. Morgenthau considers the economist his principal friend, but, in fact, he is bound to be his most severe critic. Why should an economy based upon the international division of labor make for war, and an economy of autarchy, as prescribed by Mr. Morgenthau for Germany, make for peace? It is stupid to assume that any industry, no matter how large, is in itself a suitable tool of war. A war economy has to contain everything that is vital for the waging of total war over a period of time. German industry, if left to itself, will not even remotely approach such completeness. Many years of protective tariffs were needed to build up German agriculture to the point where it could provide most of Germany's food; the protective tariff also had much to do with the size of Germany's iron-producing industries.

In spite of this Hitler could not have thought of war in January, 1933. It required several years of preparations before he was in the position, at Munich, to take a serious chance. These years were filled with the purchasing of stockpiles and the manufacture, on the basis of government subsidies, of all kinds of uneconomical substitutes—notably the large-scale production of synthetic rubber and gasoline, and the exploitation of a very low grade of iron ore. A German economy of the future, free from such artificial stimulants, will find itself dependent upon foreign countries for the very commodities without which it is impossible either to make or to move the instruments of modern war. Under such conditions, the economy of Hamburg would be linked more closely to that of London than to that of Berlin, and the Ruhr district more to the industries of Belgium, France and Luxemburg and to the shipping of the Netherlands than to the industry of Central Germany. A policy designed to bring about this result would not conflict with our moral convictions, since it would help rather than hinder the recovery of a tolerable living standard in Germany. It would be easy to enforce, since some of the most effective controls could be applied from outside rather than from the inside alone.

The Potsdam policies are damaging the economy of Germany's neighbors as well as of Germany itself. Kenesaw M. Landis, who is as sound and decisive in his news-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper column as was his forebear in presiding over the fate of American baseball, discussed Potsdam under the heading, "Our Peace Program: Misery Loves Company." It means misery for Rotterdam if it can no longer function as the normal outlet for Ruhr industries. Misery becomes chronic for the poor tobacco farmer in Greece and Bulgaria who, by losing his German market, loses that margin which made life bearable. Recently, a newspaper reported that there were in Denmark, available for shipment, 100,000 cattle which would normally have gone to Germany, and for which no market could be found. In this case, a relief agency will buy them eventually, but the American taxpayer, upon whom relief expenditures come to rest in the final resort, can hardly be expected to reach into his pockets indefinitely.

We are told that Germany's neighbors will get Germany's "surplus" industrial plants. What they will get is glorified junk. Every American businessman knows the difference between the "knock-down" value of his plant and its value as a going concern. Apparently Mr. Morgenthau is so used to deficit spending that he no longer has much regard for normal cost accounting.

In conclusion, let us consider the more practical view expressed in the report of the House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, headed by Representative Colmer of Mississippi:

"If the whole future recovery of Europe is to be geared to fear of the bogey of Germany, reduced in its boundaries and stripped of its war-making capacity as modern Germany is, the recovery of Europe becomes a hopeless problem.

"The committee does not favor the rebuilding of Germany by loans as was done after the last war, but it equally views with disfavor the starvation of Germany, the crippling of the industrial systems of Europe, and the consequent need for continuing relief or for continuing chaos in Europe."

In an earlier passage:

"The only foreseeable danger that Germany presents, in the judgment of the committee, after conferences with our military commanders and political representatives, is as a source of infection for the health, economic and social life of all Europe . . .

"General Eisenhower's expressed opinion, fully backed by General Montgomery's recent pronouncement, could be summarized in his own simple language to the committee: 'We want a lean Germany but not a hungry Germany. A hungry people is a dangerous people.' This danger is not from the point of view of war-making but of political anarchy and of creating a vacuum in Europe which may be filled with explosive potentialities."

"Explosive potentialities." Ponder that term. If it is peace that we want, the pauperism decreed in the Potsdam of today will lead us there as little as did the militarism practiced in the Potsdam of yore. Peace and a reasonable measure of prosperity go together; misery spawns tyranny and war. Let us agree, then, with Professor Frank W. Notestein, the Director of the Institute of Population Research at Princeton University, who said: "What Europe needs is more production, not more poverty."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second of two articles

The Shifting Balance of World Population

By Kingsley Davis

Professor of Anthropology and Sociology, Princeton University

MILITARY manpower roughly parallels total population. But the countries in Class I are faced with aging populations, while those in Class III are burdened with heavy proportions of children. The highest ratio of military manpower to total population is found in Class II countries.

The important thing about manpower is not only what is available now, but what will be available in the next 15 years. Replacements must obviously come from males now less than 15 years old. The ratio of males under 15 to males 20-34 years of age is therefore an index of replacement possibilities. The larger the ratio the better off a country is in proportion to its population. Below are the ratios for some leading nations.

Japan	1.59
Russia	1.43
U. S. A.	1.03
Germany	0.99
United Kingdom	0.92

It is clear that Japan and Russia will not only gain population more rapidly than the others, but will increase their military manpower even faster. They can replace their recent military losses far more easily than can the other major belligerents.

The increasing burden of aged persons in Class I countries is serious. In 1850 the United States had only 3 per cent of its population over 65 years of age. By 1940 the percentage stood at 7, and by 1970 it will be about 10. The trend is similar in northwestern Europe and the British dominions. Military efficiency will certainly be impeded by this heavy concentration in the senile age brackets.

The sweep of industrial progress to new areas and the resulting potential growth of population in these areas pose many problems for the older industrialized nations. As usual, however, many fears have arisen that are not based on fact but on illusion.

One groundless fear is that numerical dominance by Asiatics will "reduce" the whole world to the current Oriental level of living. This view reflects in part the Anglo-American white superiority complex, which holds that Asiatics differ inherently from Europeans. It overlooks the likelihood that if the Asiatics make the changes that will give them world dominance, they will lose much of their Oriental mode of life. They will become more like Europeans, and will eventually show a declining fertility. Japan is a good illustration, for she has gone farther than any other Oriental people in borrowing Western culture and thus increasing her power;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but, as a consequence, her fertility has also begun to drop, so that despite an immediate growth she too will eventually approach a stationary population. The existing civilization of the Orient is not fixed in the genes of the Asiatic races. It is rather an historical stage resembling in some respects the medieval civilization of Europe, destined to pass irretrievably as the Asiatics become westernized. If the Asiatics do not take over modern culture, their huge populations will not enable them to achieve political dominance.

PIECEMEAL BORROWING

To think that the Asiatics can borrow and utilize successfully the instrumentalities of the West without also borrowing its other features is a sociological error. The techniques of public health, for example, cannot be fully acquired without also acquiring the science that underlies them, and hence the morality of science, the competitive selection of talented personnel, the capitalization of public education, the idea of free research and the other institutions of modern society. Western civilization is not a tight system whose parts fit together as neatly as the parts of an organism, but it is a social order whose parts are functionally related. It may be borrowed piecemeal as long as the borrowers are a rural proletariat under European masters, but it cannot be borrowed piecemeal in such a way as to give dominance to a people. The Japanese were powerful because they had borrowed much of western culture, but they have lost now because they did not borrow enough.

In short, if western civilization is to be diffused around the globe, as is apparently happening, there is no reason to fear that an increase of Asiatic races will cause the whole world to "sink" to the level of present-day Oriental civilization.

Not only is it feared that Asiatics will gain world dominance by demographic and technological growth, but also that they will demand the right to migrate to regions now held by westerners. In truth they have already expressed this demand. But if they come with the traits of modern civilization, there is little rational reason to exclude them on grounds of race. If, on the other hand, they come as representatives of a less efficient civilization, there is good reason to exclude them, except to the extent to which they can be fully assimilated.

Settlement of advanced areas by people still in the high-fertility and high-mortality stage may not be welcomed by citizens already in these areas. The region of exodus will not be greatly benefited, and the area of entry may be retarded. In any case a mere extension of current Asiatic civilization to new areas would not solve any problem, and to avoid such a result the European peoples would be justified in holding the lands they have, no matter how "vacant" these lands appear to the Asiatics. As Fiji and Trinidad illustrate, the Asiatics are capable of installing in new lands the same wasteful demographic balance that they preserve at home. On the other hand, as the cases of Hawaii and the United States show, it is possible for migrants to lose the cultural traits that gave them high

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fertility. It would seem, therefore, that from a rational point of view the maximum limit on Asiatic migration into a Western country would be the number who can be rapidly assimilated. In practice, however, Anglo-American race prejudice, a popular attitude based on biological mythology, obstructs the assimilation process. A danger is that this prejudice will eventually cause the Asiatics, after they have absorbed our civilization, to become our solid enemies.

NO BEEHIVE WORLD

The fear of a beehive world in which 10 to 20 billion people eke out a bare livelihood rests on illusion rather than probability. It falsely assumes that the resources of an advanced civilization may all be turned in the direction of feeding ever greater numbers. Most modern inventions are not designed to increase the amount of food, but to add to our standard of living in other respects. Indeed, the peculiar thing is that once a society abandons the subsistence idea, it can actually support more people. This is because technological advance, developed in many cases with no immediate thought of increasing the food supply, often turns out to improve nourishment as well. But—and this is the point—having increased the food supply by this means, the society cannot retain the supply without also retaining the advanced standard of living. It cannot sink back to mere subsistence, because its food-producing capacity depends on all its other capacities, which would disappear under subsistence conditions.

Suppose, by way of illustration, that the United States were to raise its fertility to that of India, keeping its mortality at today's low level. Its population would then more than double itself each generation. What would happen? Obviously there would come a time when the demand for nourishment would take precedence over other demands. One convenient item to reduce would be education, because then the manpower of adolescents could be used to produce food. Another would be recreation, because this involves a waste of energy. Still another would be the publication of books and magazines, because these cannot be eaten. To keep people from starving, economy after economy would have to be introduced. For a while the country might gain in efficiency, but eventually it would begin to lose it, because real cultural advance would stop. Science would soon begin to disintegrate. The medical profession would go downhill. Agricultural progress would itself be halted. In the end the very economies that were enforced to secure adequate nutriment would curtail advances in food production. The death rate would begin to rise and would eventually reach the point where it would balance the high fertility. The population would then be "adjusted" to its environment, but the adjustment would be that of subsistence, not that of advanced civilization. Furthermore, the actual population would probably be less than that supported formerly at the higher standard of living.

The notion of a beehive world seems logically indefensible. But,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one will say, there are millions of people in Asia who are either actually starving or so badly nourished that they are easy prey to disease. Even in our own country there are many whose diets are below the minimum for good health. Surely this means that a great increase of population, particularly in the already heavily peopled areas of the Orient, will mean mass starvation. Surely it means that the world's population is already exceeding its food supply.

This argument seems plausible, but when taken in an absolute sense it is misleading. The very fact that numbers have increased indicates that the means to support them is there. Otherwise mortality would have risen and the population would never have grown to its present size. To think of the world's population as "outrunning" its normal food supply is like thinking of the hind feet of a horse outrunning the front feet.

It is true that one cause of mortality is still starvation, whether coming occasionally as famine or regularly as undernourishment. Such starvation, however, does not arise from the inherent limitations on potential food production, but from present patterns of distribution and consumption. It seriously affects only certain classes in particular areas. It is a relative, not an absolute matter in the world today. Even so, it is a problem of large dimensions.

If the undernourished classes in certain areas are given plenty of food, and if nothing else in their lives is changed, they will suffer a lesser mortality and their numbers will consequently grow. They will build their population up to the new food supply and start starving all over again, with more people to starve this time.

REDUCED FERTILITY

For this reason the population problem in backward areas such as India and Egypt cannot be solved simply by food relief. Over the long run it can be solved only by reducing fertility. If fertility is high, then mortality must also be high. To reduce mortality without also reducing fertility is, at best, a temporary and hazardous expedient.

In those countries where all classes limit their fertility, a minimum standard of nourishment can be set and achieved, but not in those where fertility remains uncontrolled. If, for example, the rest of the world were willing to feed them, the Hindus in India would probably multiply until they were rubbing elbows. If, later, the relief were suddenly withdrawn, millions of them would starve, and the population problem would be back where it started.

This does not mean that the advanced nations should callously let their more fertile neighbors starve, but it does mean that long-range food distribution should not be undertaken without a corresponding effort to reduce fertility. The same counsel applies to any other means of reducing deaths, whether it be by improved medicine, better sanitation or public health. Unless these are accompanied by fundamental changes in the economic and social organization — changes that will reduce fertility—they are futile.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The real danger is not a beehive world, or a starving world, but a world that steadfastly refuses to lower its fertility. Such a world would be one in which cultural progress stopped short of a complete transition from subsistence agriculture to industrial civilization, and in which the demographic transition, begun by western peoples, never spread to the rest of the globe. It would mean a return to the old balance of high birth rates and high death rates, and life would once more be wasteful, brutish and short. Such a tragedy could occur, but it is not likely.

EFFECT OF CULTURE

Various indices show that today the world's cultural development is going ahead faster than its population growth. This suggests that the Asiatic and other peoples will acquire modern civilization in time to check their fertility and achieve an efficient birth-death balance. If future population increases appear formidable, it is well to recall that they can hardly occur on a purely agricultural basis. They require industrialization. This being true, the prospect that there will be too many people to support at a higher level of living is not likely.

The danger that the interim growth of numbers will exhaust our natural resources also seems remote. Agricultural production has been increasing even faster than population. No one knows the future miracles of technology, but as the use of atomic power suggests, it seems safe to conclude that technical advance will go ahead rapidly, and that it will find new ways to use those of the world's resources that are constantly renewable rather than those that are exhaustible.

An excellent index of modernization is literacy. In 1930, according to estimates prepared by the Office of Population Research, about 59 per cent of the world's population 10 or more years old was illiterate. The continents, however, as the figures below show, were extremely unequal — four per cent for North America as against more than 80 per cent for Asia.*

These figures are crude composite estimates, but they suggest that the countries enjoying the highest literacy have, in general, the lowest birth rates. This implies that when the now illiterate countries

*World	Per Cent Illiterate (Age 10 & Over) 59	Per Cent Dependent on Agriculture 60	Crude Birth Rates 39
North America	4	52	20
Oceania	14	30	23
Europe	15	36	23
U.S.S.R.	40	67	45
South America	54	65	41
Middle America	59	72	44
Asia	81	69	44
Africa	88	77	48

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undergo the social changes that reduce illiteracy, they will also experience a corresponding decline in fertility.

How long such changes will take is hard to say, but there is some evidence that they will not take long. In 1875 Chile was 77 per cent illiterate; by 1930, only 44 per cent so. In 1897 Russia's population age 9 and over was 76 per cent illiterate; by 1939, only 19 per cent so.

In 1930 approximately 60 per cent of the world's people were dependent on agriculture, but again the continents were unequal. Actually, with existing techniques, only a small portion of the population (say 20 per cent) need be engaged in agriculture to furnish the total population with food. The possibility of rapid industrialization in China and India, in South America, Africa and the Near East, is more than a dream. Already India, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Palestine and Turkey have made a definite start. With these prospects in view, a rapid growth of the world's population for the next few decades need not imply perpetual growth or eventual catastrophe. Already in what were once the world's fastest growing areas the population has approached a stationary or declining state. It seems likely, then, that the next century will see a general reduction of fertility and the peak of the world's numbers reached.

This is an optimistic conclusion, based on the belief that the sweep of social change will brush aside the impediments to lowered fertility (including its opponents). It does not overlook the real problems that lie ahead—the pains, imbalances, struggles and injustices that inevitably attend the process of industrialization on the one hand and the differences of regional growth on the other. As the cases of Russia (in retrospect) and India (in prospect) illustrate, it is virtually impossible to make the transition from agriculture to industry without dislocating and disorganizing great sections of the population. The best that can be done is to use modern knowledge to make the transition as quick and smooth as possible. At the same time, the powerful nations of the past must adapt themselves to new giants created by technological diffusion and demographic expansion. In this, and in the handling of industrialization, an intelligent world population policy can be of immense service. It must be a policy based on facts rather than prophesies of doom or visions of paradise. It must realize that a nation's feeling of being "overpopulated" is not a legitimate ground for war or appeasement. It must insist that if mortality is to be controlled, fertility must also be controlled—that there is no other way, if the world's population problem is ultimately to be solved.

• Some people have heads like doorknobs—anybody can turn them.
—Arkansas Baptist

• Definition of an ash tray: something to put cigarette butts in when the room hasn't a floor.
—National Safety News

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor leaders should study implications of third party movement

Labor and the Two-Party System

By Mary Katharine Strong

AS the nation's politicians grid for the 1946 congressional and the 1948 presidential elections, vague rumblings of discontent are making themselves heard. Members of organized labor, at least, are expressing dissatisfaction with our present political organizations. Labor feels that it has sold its political potency for a mess of betrayals. Most unions are so thoroughly identified with one party that both Republican and Democratic congressmen feel safe in ignoring their demands—the Democrats because they are confident that, regardless of how many times they pigeon-hole social legislation desired by labor, when noses are counted the majority of the workingmen will be in the Democratic fold, if only because they consider it the lesser of two evils; the Republicans, because they feel they cannot capture the majority of the labor vote anyway as long as the party tends to be identified in the public mind with management.

Labor, like the rest of the country, was willing to give President Truman its full support when he first assumed office. A universal "wait-and-see-give-a-man-a-fair-chance" attitude prevailed. The President's 21-point message to Congress on September 6 was right down labor's alley. But Congress made short-shift of the honeymoon. The faithful coalition of Southern Democrats and right-wing Republicans was working in high gear. The vast majority of the measures requested by the President have ended in the crowded congressional graveyard. But hope persisted that Truman "would do something" to force congressional action.

But the rash of reconversion strikes and the failure of the labor-management conference could no longer be ignored. The honeymoon's coup de grace came with the President's answer to the General Motors, oil, electrical and steel strikes. His fact-finding plan had the dubious distinction of uniting both labor and management. The latter opposed the suggestion that the proposed boards be empowered to examine company books to determine an industry's ability to grant wage increases. Labor was fighting mad at the suggested limitations on its right to strike. In the words of R. J. Thomas, UAW-CIO president, Mr. Truman's proposed program "would tear from the hands of labor unions the major weapon essential to effective collective bargaining with the anti-labor managerial groups of billion dollar corporations."

As a result of the above, there have once again been whispers of a third party movement on the Ameri-

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can political scene. This is but a natural tendency when a major group of one party becomes dissatisfied with that party's leadership or program, or when it strongly conflicts with other elements in the same camp. When bedfellows are too strange, there is a desire to kick your companion out of bed or move yourself. Anger at the strangle-hold exercised by the Southern Democrats and disappointment in Truman's leadership have made labor leaders think wistfully, if not too seriously, about a third party, combining the liberal groups of both parties. For there have been recent and equally futile attempts by the left wing of the Republican party to liberalize that group. The most recent crusade came from Newbold Morris, who gained national attention by polling 408,000 votes in the New York mayoralty race, running as an independent. Mr. Morris has advocated the creation within the Republican party of an organization similar to the Political Action Committee "to", in his words, "root out reactionary Republican leaders." He says that his suggested organization "would not be limited to Republicans, any more than the PAC membership is confined to Democrats and American laborites. But by the natural force of circumstances, it would be predominantly Republican." The possible merger of these two groups could be the foundation of a third party.

From the opposition camp we have George Addes, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, saying, "Failure on the part of either of the old established parties to adopt and follow through on a liberal program will quickly hasten the day when organized labor will join hands with other groups in the formation on a national basis of a third party, a party whose program will be for all of the people and not a privileged few."

UNIQUE INSTITUTION

These rumblings of discontent serve to call attention to a unique Anglo-American institution—the two-party system. With several exceptions our national political history has been the struggle for power by two parties who between them poll more than 90 per cent of the votes. For over 80 years it has been the same two parties wooing the American public. Why, in a country as diverse and large as the United States, has the two-party system prevailed?

It has been customary since Washington's time to blame political dissention and corruption upon political parties. But no one would deny that a party system is inevitable in a large country. Some form of organization is necessary when democracy gets beyond the Greek city-state stage; the voters can never be expected to be of one mind upon political principles and policies or to agree spontaneously upon persons to be nominated for office. Political parties, imperfect though they be, come the nearest to filling this need.

But agreed upon the necessity of a party system, there is a sharp difference of opinion as to the type of party structure which will best serve the ends of democracy. A one-party country cannot help but be a dictatorship, so we are faced with the problem of two parties versus many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties, on the European style. Many continental political scientists label our two-party system a farce. It is perfectly true that to suppose that there are but two sides to each public issue is naive, and it is equally obvious that many times the parties do not recognize as issues, either because of expediency or lack of national interest, those problems which third and fourth parties raise. If political parties are to provide for all shades of public opinion, the multiple-party system seems inevitable. The two-party has thus been accused of failing in what many consider its fundamental duty, that of organizing public opinion and giving it expression.

Moreover, the similarity of the programs initiated by our two parties has led European observers to speak of "the moral decomposition of the parties." They note that the programs are so alike that the choice is no longer between two policies but between persons, two rival candidates. As to the nominees, it is often heard that positive ideas, convictions, and strong character disqualify a man for public life. The party organization is accused of giving preference to colorless, easily managed men.

Foreign political scientists maintain that we shall never be politically mature until our parties are based on fundamental conflicting ideas, rather than mainly upon candidates, with the only major difference between the parties being that one is "in" while its less fortunate brother is "out". We accuse the Europeans of being doctrinaire; they say our main fault is hero-worship.

A significant part of the American political structure is overlooked by those who suggest we should have parties based on fundamental principles. Unlike most European countries, our two major parties, and 99 per cent of the public, are agreed on political fundamentals. Respect for the Constitution, the Supreme Court, the Bill of Rights, federalism and the natural process of democracy must be paid at least lip-service if any party hopes to win elections. We have no racial minorities with historic roots and special territorial interests, no large army to constitute a great separate class in our social system, and the principle of separation of church and state is well-established.

SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE

Similarity of platforms and policies, which constitutes a major source of criticism of our political system, is obviously necessary if the parties are to represent many parts of a large country, each section with its special problems and interests. There is probably more difference of ideas between a Georgia Democrat and a follower of Tammany Hall than there is between an Ohio Democrat and a Pennsylvania Republican. To make a platform acceptable to varying interests within a party, planks are necessarily vague. The spirit of compromise is forever present, but at least the voters realize that they are choosing between various forms of compromise. This is far better than the type of compromise found in the multiple-party system. In many European countries each party sticks dogmatically to its special program during election time and then enters into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compromise with other parties to form blocs and ministeries. In both cases compromise has been effected, only in the latter case the electorate has no voice in the type of compromise into which his party enters.

Because party platforms are built to appeal to many sections of the country, they are seldom radical. When a party does appeal to only one region, the necessary spirit of cooperation will be entirely lacking should that party secure control of the national government. In 1860 11 states seceded rather than be governed by a Republican president representing one section of the country. The greater the similarity between parties, and the more obvious it is to the losers that all is not lost when the voters turn thumbs down, the more likely is it that the minority party will be content to confine itself to the role of the "loyal opposition" and make plans for the next election. When the difference between the two parties becomes excessive, the losers feel justified in waging an underground, sniping, continuous war against the administration to "save the country" from their measures.

Without a two-party system in this country, we would have the spectacle of plurality presidents. It would be possible for a man capturing but a few of the larger states to become president. Frequently in our history we have had three or more major parties competing in the presidential arena. In 1848 a third party, the Free Soil, arose to confront the Whigs and Democrats. The Whig candidate, Taylor, won the election, polling 1,360,000 votes. But Cass, the Democratic nominee, had 1,220,000 votes, and Van Buren, the Free Soil candidate, received 291,000 votes. In other words, Taylor was a minority president, polling 1,360,000 votes while the opposition had 1,511,000.

The most obvious example of a minority president, however, was Lincoln in 1860. The Democrats split, with one faction nominating Douglas and the other selecting Breckinridge. The two Democrats between them polled 2,220,000 votes, while Lincoln received 1,866,000, or 39 per cent of the votes cast. Lincoln became president because he barely ran ahead in the larger states, and thus captured 180 electoral votes, while Douglas and Breckinridge received 84 electoral votes. One wonders how different the course of our history would have been had the Democrats not split.

An examination of election statistics shows how common plurality presidents have been, if the popular vote is counted. Even a very small, short-lived third party makes its influence felt in this regard. Since, however, the plurality president usually captures the majority of the major states, with their large electoral votes, the House of Representatives has seldom been called in to decide the issue. The Hayes-Tilden fight is well-known, but few realize that if the minor parties running at that time were included in the popular total, Hayes' minority becomes even more marked. The final results were:

Tilden	Democrat	4,284,885
Hayes	Republican	4,033,950
Cooper	Greenback	81,740
Smith	Prohibition	9,522
Walker	American	2,626

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In other words, Hayes, the winner, received 4,033,950 while the various losers totaled 4,378,773. Less known, however, are the elections of 1880, 1884, 1892 and 1916, where the same situation prevailed.

	Candidate	Party	Popular Vote	Winner-Loser Votes
1880	Garfield	Republican	4,449,053	4,449,053 - 4,760,535
	Hancock	Democrat	4,442,035	
	Weaver	Greenback	307,306	
	Dow	Prohibition	10,487	
	Phelps	American	707	
1884	Cleveland	Democrat	4,911,017	4,911,017 - 5,133,968
	Blaine	Republican	4,848,334	
	Butler	Greenback	133,825	
	St. John	Prohibition	151,809	
1892	Cleveland	Democrat	5,554,414	5,554,414 - 6,510,353
	Harrison	Republican	5,190,802	
	Bidwell	Prohibition	271,058	
	Weaver	People's	1,027,329	
	Wing	Socialist	21,164	

One of the most famous presidential elections occurred in 1912, when the personal animosity between Teddy Roosevelt and President Taft caused the election of Woodrow Wilson. Hatred of Taft and chagrin at not being nominated by the Republican convention led T. R. to bolt the party and capture the Progressive nomination. The two Republicans between them polled 7,609,942 votes while Wilson received 6,286,214, or a plurality of 41 per cent. If all five parties are included in the 1912 tabulations, Wilson's opponents received two million more votes than did he.

In all the above cases the third parties were not particularly strong, and the candidate with a plurality has in all but one case received the majority of electoral votes by capturing the major states. But it is not difficult to imagine what the consequences would be if three major parties were competing for the 531 electoral votes. According to the Constitution: "The person having the greatest number of (electoral) votes for President, shall be President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest number not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President." It is safe to say that abandonment of the two-party system would give the House of Representatives the final voice in the choice of most presidents. The genius of our present system, with its glaring inefficiencies and corruption, is that it has allowed the United States to avoid the destructive blight of government by a minority.

All the above is not to deny that the composition of our two parties is illogical and often proves a stumbling block to the furtherance of any consistent policy. But it is this same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

broad basis and diverse interest of the major parties which affords the best guarantees that the power to govern will be used cautiously. While the parties are dominated by middle-class attitudes and sentiments, which is necessary under the two-party system, the habit of political moderation, which the English observer, James Bryce, regarded as one of the important grounds for optimism concerning our future, seems likely to continue unimpaired.

In addition, the quality of the opposition tends to differ according to the political system in which it finds itself. Under the multiple-party system, no group by itself can control the government or gain a dominant position in the state. This results in a total lack of political responsibility, and opposition may be and often is carried to any lengths. In the United States and England, the organized opposition usually feels a high sense of responsibility, knowing that it may be called upon to assume control of the government after the next election.

Even the charge of Europeans that our system produces few great presidents fails to be substantiated by history. Certainly not all of our leaders have been great, nor have all of France's or Weimar Germany's prime ministers been great. The vast majority of our presidents have been honorable, and there has seldom been a crisis in which we lacked competent leadership. The simple answer to the charge of poor candidates is that the people will not vote for a man they consider, rightly or wrongly, objectionable, as was shown in 1928 when five of the "Solid South" states went Republican. "The fear of the people is the beginning of the wisdom of the politicians."

Labor leaders should study well the implications of a third party movement even when they are thinking of this course of action only subconsciously. In 1948 it would guarantee a Republican election. This, however, might well be in labor's interest, since the grip of the Southern Democrats would then be greatly weakened. Organized labor will probably refuse to take the decisive step, and, in the CIO at least, will concentrate on bringing its strength to bear within the party system, to defeat those congressmen whom it considers unfriendly to labor. While the recent elections in England and France may tempt the unions to strike out on their own, their more intelligent leaders realize that, because one particular party system has worked in one country, it is no guarantee that it will succeed equally well in another. The workings of political machinery depend upon the history and psychology of a nation. It is doubtful whether a two-party system would ever work successfully in European countries. It is almost certain that a multiple-party system would fail in this country.

• The older generation thought nothing of getting up at six in the morning . . . We can assure you the younger generation doesn't think much of it either.

—*The Slipstream*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gilbert and Sullivan—fathers of modern musical comedy

The Savoyards

By Charlotte E. Braun

IN 1869, England was living in the golden age of Victoria. It was, too, the golden age of the bourgeoisie, the era of sentimentality and the triumph of the commonplace. In retrospect, then, it is hard to see how a musical phenomenon such as the Gilbert and Sullivan association could appear and flourish, unless it was decreed by fate that some leaven was necessary, even for the Victorian palate.

Perhaps that is why William Gilbert and Arthur Sullivan were bound to meet. It was a casual introduction, with little to indicate that it would lead to perhaps the most famous collaboration in musical history. At the time of the meeting, both young men had already attained a measure of popularity in their respective fields, but neither had as yet found the magic touchstone of fame.

Gilbert, the elder of the two by six years, came of a family of some means and was surrounded from early childhood by the literati and theatre people who were constant visitors at his home. At the age of two, Gilbert started his musical comedy career. He was taken to the Continent where, in Naples, he was tricked out of his nurse's hands by two bandits and held for £25 ransom. In later years he claimed to remember the incident perfectly and who is to deny it, for, again and again, in his operettas recurs the theme of infants exchanged in their cradles, or mix-ups caused by careless or stupid governesses. So, even at that early age, Gilbert was "gathering material" for his future works.

The sly wit that was to enliven the English comedy stage manifested itself early. At school, Gilbert was known as a sharp-tongued, touchy boy, quick to take offense and more ready to make enemies than friends. His intense competiveness made him a good student. Many young boys run off to sea or to the circus: William Gilbert ran off to the theatre. Unfortunately for him, the director of the theatre he chose was an old friend of his father's and promptly packed him off to school again. Gilbert went on to take his degree at the University of London, but his spirit was still restless and he decided to try for a commission in the Army fighting the Crimean War. The war ended too soon—luckily for the English comedy stage.

As Gilbert had grown up in a literary atmosphere so Arthur Sullivan, the "Mr. Music" of the team, grew up in a completely musical family. Son of an Irish father and Italian mother, he was born in London in 1842. He was virtually raised on music, for his father play-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed with the band at Sandhurst and Arthur was often allowed to sit in on a rehearsal and play one or the other of the instruments—usually in the wind section. It was this early band, rather than orchestral training, which gives Sullivan's music it's distinctive character. It also explains his ability, in later years, to orchestrate his scores with amazing rapidity—he had acquired a knack for it by a process of musical "osmosis" throughout his childhood.

His earliest public success came when he joined the choir of the Chapel Royal. He was immediately given solo parts to sing and won the praise of Queen Victoria herself, who sent him 10 shillings. Sullivan was already displaying the characteristics that were to make him such a popular figure throughout his life. Quiet, and physically rather small and weak, he had an almost uncanny faculty for making friends. This was true among his contemporaries as well as among adults. It was said later, that Sullivan made friends as readily as Gilbert made enemies. Strangely enough, the charm of the one and the biting wit of the other were later to blend into such a perfect whole.

The musical mentor of London, until the time of his death, had been Felix Mendelssohn. When Sullivan was 14 years old, it was decided to establish a music scholarship at the Conservatory at Leipzig in memory of this great favorite. The luck of the Irish was with Sullivan —he won the scholarship.

In Leipzig, as in London, Sullivan immediately became popular in the circle of young musicians at the Conservatory—in particular among the young ladies. In fact, so great was the young man's charm, that he became an object of rivalry between sisters and good friends. It cannot be said that he ignored their attentions, but Sullivan was a light-hearted 17 at the time and he was enjoying his musical successes far too much to become a mere "ladies' man." As it was, he struck the happy medium between work and play and won the praise of his instructors as well as the admiration of the salons.

BAB BALLADS

Gilbert and Sullivan came to public attention at almost the same time. The former, after having spent several depressing years in the Education Department, had turned to law, but this too proved unsatisfactory. In fact, Gilbert did little more than pay his annual dues. He was living in London's Bohemia, writing what he himself termed "doggerel." Still, despite the doggerel rhymes, the sharpness of the wit was not lost on the public. His work began to appear regularly in the publication *Fun,* a prototype of *Punch,* under the title, "Bab Ballads." Mostly, the ballads treated grotesque themes, or burlesqued serious ones and were illustrated by line cuts done by Gilbert himself. This was in 1861.

The following year, Sullivan had his first great success in London. He returned from Leipzig with the score for incidental music to Shakespeare's *Tempest.* The music was well-received and won for Sullivan the friendship of Charles Dickens, with whom he subsequently went to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris. There followed, from Sullivan's pen, a large number of incidental compositions, many of them "parlor pieces" of the type which adorned every Victorian music stand. Like Gilbert, the young composer was having difficulty in finding his niche in the musical world and he was in danger of falling into the sentimental slough of the sixties. In order to remain in the public eye, he was setting to music anything that came his way, including a number of inferior poems by Tennyson. However, both Gilbert and Sullivan were slowly coming to the crossing of their paths.

The former had now ventured into musical comedy, via the burlesque. He singled out a number of popular operas of the day and wrote parodies of them. Some examples are *Dulcamara; or, The Little Duck and the Great Quack, (L'Elisir d'amore); The Merry Zingara; or, The Pipsy-Wipsy and the Tipsy Gypsy, (Bohemian Girl);* and *The Pretty Druidess; or, The Mother, the Maid and the Mistletoe Bough, (Norma).* These burlesques were, for the most part, quite crude—Gilbert at his worst. Yet, they pointed the way to the Savoy operettas that were to be their offspring.

Two years later, in 1869, Gilbert started to prepare librettos for German Reed, whose "Illustrative Gatherings" were the Victorian euphemism for theatre. Humor and cleverness began to replace cheap wit, and the foundations for *Pinafore, Pirates of Penzance,* etc., were strengthened.

It is for these same "Illustrative Gatherings" that Sullivan had started to prepare scores, to librettos by Burnand. Two of the pieces, *Cox and Box,* and *Contrabandista,* met with considerable success, the former having a run of 300 performances.

THE TWO MEET

It was at this point that William Gilbert and Arthur Sullivan finally met, although two years were to pass before their collaboration began. At that, the first venture was hardly a success. *Thespis* ran for just one month and did not play to full houses in that time. Thereupon the partnership was dissolved and Sullivan returned to more serious music. An oratorio, *The Light of the World,* a *Te Deum* and a number of lighter works established him as the leading composer in England. A degree of Doctor of Music from Cambridge confirmed his position.

It was the merest chance that led Gilbert and Sullivan together again. The former had prepared a libretto, *Trial by Jury,* based on one of his early Bab Ballads and had given it to Carl Rosa for scoring. However, the latter was unable to complete the task. Some time later, Gilbert took the piece to Richard D'Oyly Carte, manager of the Royalty Theatre. Carte needed a short opening piece and suggested that Sullivan set the verses to music.

The composer was delighted with Gilbert's libretto—he was, in fact, convulsed with laughter during the reading and in three weeks had completed the scoring and the rehearsals. The work was presented on the same program with *La Périchole,* a tuneful operetta by that master of light music, Jacques Offenbach. Yet, within a few weeks, it was *Trial by Jury* that the audience

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came to see. Thus, unpretentiously, English comic opera was reborn and the pattern was started for the Savoy operetta. There was the unique use of the chorus, so different from the overblown character of Italian opera; there was also the famous autobiographical ditty which was to recur in every Gilbert and Sullivan operetta: The Judge's song: "When I, good Friends, was called to the bar;" the magician's song, "Oh! my name is John Wellington Wells;" Sir Joseph's autobiography, "When I was a lad I served a term," among others.

The success of *Trial by Jury* gave D'Oyly Carte an inspiration—why not form a comic opera company on the style of those on the Continent for the purpose of encouraging and propagating English comic opera. It was time to break the influence of the French stage in Britain and this seemed the ideal moment. Accordingly, in 1876 the Comedy Opera Company was organized. Its first production was *H.M.S. Pinafore.* Written for the company which D'Oyly Carte had organized, it was a much better work than its predecessor. Its satire was more pointed, the music more polished. It added to the typical plot situation the elderly lady with her elderly admirer, the youthful pair parted and re-united, all of which were shortly to become traditional. Again, the venture was crowned with success, not only in London, but in the United States as well, where a pirated production was playing some months before the composer and librettist came to the States. Some of its lines became stock phrases in ordinary conversation, as for example the "What! Never?"—"Hardly ever." combination, which still crops up today, 75 years later. It got to be too much for the authors themselves and in the *Pirates of Penzance,* Gilbert included a line about "that infernal nonsense, *Pinafore.*" Nor could they escape their own creation on a subsequent visit to the continent where, at a royal reception at Kiel, Prince Wilhelm, future Kaiser of Germany, bowed to Sullivan and sang, as a chorus of one: "He polished up the handle of the big front door."

TEAMWORK

It was in an interview published in the New York *Herald* that Gilbert commented on their method of collaboration: "We have been working together harmoniously for the last seven years and have learned to understand each other so thoroughly that even the faintest suggestion of the one meets with a ready and sympathetic response from the other. In all this period of active co-operation it has never even once occurred that we have disagreed as to the way in which an idea should be carried out, be it either poetically or musically." Many years later, the team-work was not as smooth as is indicated here.

The next operetta, *Patience,* was the first to be produced in the Savoy Theatre, henceforth to be the home of the company, and from which is derived the term "Savoyard" for admirers of Gilbert and Sullivan's works. But the easy collaboration of the early operettas was becoming

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more difficult. Sullivan was growing dissatisfied with the sameness of the plot, which he referred to as the "lozenge" plot. After the completion of *Iolanthe* and *Princess Ida* he insisted that Gilbert give him a libretto of "human interest and probability" rather than the fairy tales he had been concocting. He felt that his tunes were becoming "mere repetitions," that they were beginning "to possess a strong family resemblance." In short, Sullican had grown tired (or thought he had) of the musical comedy stage. Also, personal relations between the collaborators were no longer as cordial as they had been. Sullivan felt that Gilbert was making him the butt of his witticisms and had confided to a friend that he could not stand it much longer. On the other hand, Gilbert was doing his best to patch up the misunderstanding and finally, in 1884, another plot was agreed upon—one "without the supernatural or improbable" as Sullivan hopefully put it. Gilbert gave him *The Mikado!*

Certainly, *The Mikado* did not sound like the music of a composer who was played out. Its tunes are among the most colorful in the Savoy repertoire but its plot situation were definitely in the "lozenge" tradition. Still, the verses are Gilbert at his best as are the characters.

With their next work, *Ruddigore,* the breach between the two men continued to widen. Both expressed their dissatisfaction, Gilbert writing to a friend: "That music seems to my uninstructed ear to be very fine indeed, but—out of place in a comic opera," while Sullivan complained that: "the piece was supposed to be an opera, but was really becoming a play with a few songs and some concerted music." In other words, each felt that his particular medium was being subjected to the other's.

The beginning of the end came as a result of a business, rather than an artistic, argument. It involved D'Oyly Carte, and the installation of new carpets in the Savoy Theatre, against the express wishes of Gilbert. The latter's famous temper erupted, there was a violent quarrel in which Sullivan sided with D'Oyly Carte, and the partnership, which had been so profitable both artistically and financially to both sides, was at an end. Several months later, Gilbert was moved to apologize for his rashness but Sullivan still smarted under his biting remarks. They collaborated on only one more work—the unsuccessful *Grand Duke.* The famous association did not even end grandly—it petered out slowly and damply.

However, the association had served its purpose, and, considering the wide differences in temperament between its two members, it had fared better than anyone could have hoped. It re-established English musical comedy and left a legacy of gay and charming music and witty lyrics to brighten the theatre.

• Marriages are made in heaven, but they are lived on earth.
—*Chaplain George Weiss*

• A statesman is an ex-politician who has mastered the art of holding his tongue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We cannot make a free China

Let China Alone

By Royce Brier

From his column "This World Today" in the San Francisco Chronicle

ONE of the hottest issues in the world today is China. But a good deal of heat is by the prejudiced, who don't know or care much about China or the Chinese, except as they can relate the situation to their prejudice.

Some on the Left want to see the Communists gobble up Chiang. Some on the Right want to see Chiang gobble up the Communists. The other day Mrs. Roosevelt said Mme. Chiang talks good democracy, but doesn't practice it. That is a sample. Mme. Chiang has so far refused to reply. In its way, that may be another sample.

In Washington Secretary of State Byrnes says we want a strong and independent China. Everybody agrees that is a good idea. We've all thought that since John Hay said the same thing 40 odd years ago. The immediate question is: what are we now doing toward a strong and independent China? There's been a good deal of controversy on that, and we won't go into it now.

To us, the China situation is both complex and simple. It is complex in that here we have 500,000,000 human beings, long oppressed by invasion and longer harried by revolution, surging toward new goals, driven by the forces of an ancient civilization which are often unfathomable to us. It is simple in that they are only striving toward the things which we in the West have sought over the past two or three centuries, to wit, representative self-government and a reasonable economy appropriate to their people, their soil and their historical circumstance. This should be easy, but it has proved hard for every people that has ever tried it.

First we must remember that nowhere in modern history has representative government and a reasonable economy been attained without ordeal. These are dynamic ideas in themselves, and can only be achieved by dynamic means. Therefore, we cannot expect China to achieve this goal wholly by passive agreement.

Ordeal, however, may take other forms than physical conflict, and it will be well for the Chinese and the world if they can approach their goal by methods short of civil warfare. Even so there will be suffering. When the people attain to power in any society, those who formerly held power suffer in the diminution. The redistribution of power, the leveling out, raises some and lowers others. We have gone all through that in its violent and non-violent forms, and are still going through it for that matter.

© 1945, by the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco, California

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Utopia is not here, hence we should understand the China situation in its larger sweep.

One of the foremost non-violent devices for achievement of representative government is the coalition of factions. It has been used extensively in western Europe, though it is not our normal American practice. But it is a good device to keep things in motion, a *modus vivendi,* as the diplomats say.

Since the newspapermen have got in to Yenan, they have found a solid demand in the so-called communist faction for a coalition government in which the faction will be represented in Chungking. A recent dispatch repeated the demand, and said the alternative is civil war. If the demand is not a deceptive mask for other demands (a question which cannot be determined at this distance), it is difficult to see how Western well-wishers of China could oppose it.

There is one thing, however, Westerners would be advised to get through their heads; there is nothing decisive we, meaning the Americans, can do to make a free and independent China. This is in large part forgotten by many engaging in the controversy over our policy in China since the close of the Pacific war.

It is true we could, if we had the will, marshal enough power in China to support Chiang against all comers for the present period. It may likewise be true that Soviet Russia, if it had the will, could marshal enough power over against north China in support of the Communists to keep Chiang out and to keep sporadic and indecisive civil war going for years. But neither of these courses would either make or break freedom and independence for China. They would only postpone events.

For freedom and independence cannot be given to a people by another people, let alone imposed on a people by another. A man can only be free if he wants to be free, and if he is strong enough, resolute enough and clever enough to overcome the strong, resolute and clever forces which seek to subject him. This is equally true of men in the aggregate.

So in the end it is up to the Chinese, and any prejudices the State Department in Washington may have as to what constitutes freedom and independence for them, or any implementation of those prejudices, is futile. It is like little boys playing at soldier, in which no decision of more than passing consequence can be reached.

If some of the solemn owls who want to settle the China thing from this side would read up a little on the struggle for representative government in the West, some wear and tear might be spared us.

● A young doctor and a young dentist shared the services of a receptionist and both fell in love with her.

The dentist was called away on business, so he sent for the receptionist and said: "I am going to be away for 10 days. You will find a little present in your room."

She went in, and found 10 apples.

—*Financial Post*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dilemma of the mice-slayer

"Wee, sleekit . . . beastie"

By Merwyn L. Aultman

From his column "In Perspective" in The Providence Evening Bulletin

WE'VE got mice. The cutest things you ever saw, no bigger than your thumb and right out of the movies. If one were to show up some night in velvet breeches and red suspenders, say, drawing his diminuitive son into the circle of lamplight, it wouldn't seem at all queer, not until we got to thinking about it.

Even now they stop casually to study us. If we don't move a muscle, they'll advance nearly to our shoes. Apparently we don't quite come up to their expectations, though they never lose faith. Obviously they'd like to come to some understanding with us about the potato chips, cereal and soap we spirited away after they'd gnawed neat little holes in the wrappers. That sort of thing can't go on, you know.

"I suppose we must get rid of them."

"I suppose so. Is there cheese?"

Hamlet holding Yorick's skull was in no more speculative frame of mind than I am holding a mousetrap. I wish that hypothetical fellow whom Ralph Waldo Emerson immortalized would beat a path to my doorstep with an improved and humane device—one, say, that would set itself behind my back. At least Hamlet didn't have to worry about the spring in Yorick's jaw.

I've looked high and low for a mousetrap that wouldn't make me nervous but there aren't any. This confounded thing of mine is the same kind of trap mice were using when women wore three petticoats and they all dragged on the floor—one of those round contraptions with four wire loops that spring up and strangle their victims, same wood, same wire, same dull red stain, same principle; a stupid, obvious principle of violence upon a soft and gentle creature.

The whole business wears an inward and outward anxiety. Before I get to the fourth spring, the first spring goes off and snaps the third. I set the first and third, oh so delicately, and the second goes off. For two or three rounds this goes on, me making faces all the time. Very comical. The cheese falls off. The hair triggers get bent. I'm on the point of giving up. Unexpectedly the hooks hold. I experience a fleeting sense of triumph.

It is soon swallowed up in apprehension—a kind of suspended animation shared by both me and the trap. The thing has to be handled as cautiously as a bomb. Makes me so nervous I find myself tiptoeing gingerly with it and speaking in a subdued voice if anybody is so thoughtless as to address me.

© 1945, by The Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, Providence, Rhode Island

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Sh-h-h. Mousetrap."

I hold it ve-r-r-r-y lightly. You've no idea. I keep saying to myself, "This thing's going off! This thing's going off!" I'm in a bad state. Perhaps you know about this. I move with a feathery uncertainty. A little mouse wouldn't know I was coming. The thing goes off. I drop it.

I reset it and approach the dark corner, the jelly closet, the dark-rimmed hole under the sink. I hold my breath. I bite my lower lip. I distend my nostrils woodenly like a hobbyhorse's. The shadow of a man with a shadow of a mousetrap couldn't put it down and shove it forward more gently. But there's a technical difficulty: the cheese drags. Snap! The trap leaps up, all loops sprung.

I leave it and resort to some uncompromising exercise like pounding nails or shoveling ashes to restore my manly resolution. Here's a strange thing: I can set a rat trap all right—a trap that would break the little bone in my thumb and bloody my nail. But a mousetrap is different. There's cruelty without the solace of vengeance in it. That's it. There's something fiendishly delicate about catching a mouse — something at once gentle, playful—and vicious.

Restored by my shoveling, I reset the trap with surprising felicity. Funny what the body can do for the mind! But all the time I am setting it, fragments of mouse lore run through my thoughts: The story of the aging newspaper man bereft of all companions save the bottle and the mouse in his top desk drawer. Me, later? Lenny in "Of Mice and Men" holding his pet mouse tenderly in his pocket and crushing its skull with his thumb. Me, now?

Strains of verse:

" 'Twas the night before
Christmas . . .

Not even a mouse."

Or Robert Burns':

"Wee, sleekit, cowrin, tim-rous
beastie,

O, what a panic's in they breastie!"

Compassionate fellow, Burns. Couldn't bear to rout a field mouse out of its nest. Yielding to my own compassion, I eat the fresh cube of cheese I was about to bait with.

Yes, but what about our potato chips? That's property, destruction of property, the strongest of barriers against friendly relationships. I shall have him by morning.

● This younger generation of ours is plenty smart. Take the boy who had asked his father how wars started.

"Well," answered Dad, "suppose America quarreled with England and—"

"But," interrupted the mother, 'America must never quarrel with England."

"I know," said the father, "but I am only taking a hypothetical instance."

"You are misleading the child," protested the mother.

"No, I am not," shouted the father.

"Never mind, Dad," put in the boy, "I think I know how wars start."

—*Volta Review*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill is under fire

A. M. A. Dissents

By Albert Deutsch

From his column in PM

THE A.M.A. (American Medical Association) officially declared war on President Truman's National Health Insurance plan when its policy-making body, the House of Delegates, at its annual meeting voted unanimous disapproval of both the plan and its legislative embodiment, the new Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. In voicing its opposition to the Truman plan, the House of Delegates endorsed a panic-charged editorial statement in the current issue of the A.M.A. Journal, written by Dr. Morris Fishbein.

"By this measure doctors in America would become clock watchers and slaves of a system. Now, if ever, those who believe in the American democracy must make their belief known to their representatives, so that the attempt to enslave medicine as first among the professions, industries or trades to be socialized will meet the ignominious defeat it deserves," Fishbein said.

The A.M.A. action, based on a report submitted to the House of Delegates by its Reference Committee on Legislation and Public Relations, listed five reasons for its opposition to the Truman plan and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill. These reasons appeared to this reporter as ill-founded as those advanced last week by Dr. Fishbein.

Let's analyze these five reasons:

1. "The Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill is founded on the false assumption that solution of the medical care problem for the American people is the panacea for all the troubles of the needy."

The facts: No such assumption can properly be read into the bill. It covers not only the needy, but nearly the entire American population. That the legislative sponsors of this bill do not regard it as a "panacea for all the troubles of the needy," is proved by the fact that they also are active sponsors of bills for full employment, a vastly improved social insurance system and federal housing programs.

2. "This (the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill) is the first step in the plan for general socialization not only of the medical profession but of all professions, industry, business and labor."

The facts: President Truman, in his health message to Congress, emphasized the point that his plan will not "socialize" medicine. The A.M.A. has never produced any real proof to the contrary, beyond smear words like "enslavement," "political medicine." The charge that the Truman plan and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill form part of a general plan to "socialize" the entire life of the nation is a grave

© 1945, by the Newspaper PM, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal attack on President Truman, Senators Wagner and Murray and Representative Dingell. If the A.M.A. has evidence to back up the charge, it should let the American people know. It should retract and apologize if it hasn't proof of a plot.

3. "Positive proof exists from experience in other countries that inferior medical service results from compulsory health insurance."

The facts: The British Medical Association, English counterpart of the A.M.A. which bitterly opposed the British compulsory health insurance law when it was introduced a generation ago, recently stated that the compulsory health insurance system had greatly improved the quality of medical services in Britain, and urged that the system be further extended. Medicine is at its lowest ebb in many countries lacking a compulsory health insurance system.

4. "A program such as outlined is enormously expensive. It will result in greatly increased taxes for the entire population of the United States of America."

The facts: It is estimated that the total annual cost of nationally-insured medical service, under the comprehensive Wagner - Murray - Dingell Bill, will amount to a little over three billion dollars. The medical costs of the American people now total nearly four billion dollars a year. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell measure doesn't increase the medical bill of the American public; it provides for more equitable and effective payment of the present bill. The A.M.A. charge is tricky and misleading; it implies that the costs of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell program would be over and above present costs. In fact, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill provides a way for far better medical services for Americans than they now get, at the same price.

5. "No one will ever convince the physicians of the United States that the Wagner - Murray - Dingell bill is not socialized medicine. By this measure the medical profession and the sick whom they treat will be directly under political control."

(The A.M.A. report then goes on to quote Fishbein's editorial as part of its fifth objection.)

• The director of a radio studio show wanted to get the sound effect of water being poured out of a barrel onto some boards. They tried peas on oiled paper, but that wasn't it. They tried dropping pins on a taut square of silk, and that wasn't it.

Finally, a quiet fellow who was standing nearby said, "Suppose you try pouring water out of a barrel onto some boards."

They did and that was it.

—*Wall Street Journal*

• Woodrow Wilson, despite his sober disposition, possessed a quick wit. One day, during an animated conversation, his glasses slipped down perilously near the end of his nose.

"Your glasses are almost on your mouth," his companion warned.

"That's all right," Mr. Wilson answered with a smile. "I want to see what I'm talking about."

—*Banking*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shall Congress Control Realty Prices?

Can Truman's housing policy aided by the Patman and Wagner-Ellender-Taft bills relieve the critical housing shortage?

FOR CONTROL OF HOME PRICES

In asking Congress for price controls on all residential property, President Truman moves to correct a tragic omission antedating his own presidency. Realty price controls should have come with rent controls. Because they didn't, prices have soared fantastically; many dwellings even stand vacant in wait of buyers, while the homeless sink to new depths of indignity and despair.

The same realty-builders' lobby that delayed Administration decision will undoubtedly wheel up its heaviest artillery to kill or delay action in Congress.

The lobby was smart enough to get Hugh Potter, past president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, appointed for a time as construction co-ordinator under Reconversion Director John W. Snyder. So priorities on building materials were dropped prematurely—an error now happily corrected—and Mr. Snyder spoke coolly of finished-dwelling price controls so recently as last month. Unless the American people now outdo the lobby with a stronger chorus of superior arguments, it may win once again.

The lobby says soothingly that the industry will restrain prices voluntarily. That's silly. No agent can keep the owner from charging all he can get, and few agents, since their commissions increase with the price, would dream of trying.

Furthermore, so the propaganda runs, no operative builder would dare erect new houses if prices were controlled. This threat of a sitdown strike, and also the voluntary-restraint plea, has been exposed within the industry itself. For instance, Lewis & Lamberth, a large home-building firm in Dallas that can see its own long-run interest, says this:

"The claim that the building industry will police its own members to keep prices in line, and that competition among builders will keep prices down, is sheer nonsense.

"With adequate materials and labor and an unprecedented demand, the houses will be built. The only question is whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they will be sold at reasonable prices with fair profit or at inflationary and profiteering prices. . . . We plan to start 50 houses in the next few weeks and to build 300 next year, and we will welcome the placing of ceiling prices thereon. . . ."

A third contention is that controls of home prices would be class legislation. The exact opposite is the truth. When nearly every other important cost of living is controlled, it is gross favoritism to exempt the price of houses. A control imposed now would diminish discrimination, not begin it.

Unfortunately, no control imposed now could entirely eliminate such disparity; no control could roll back the already-inflated price level. In fact, the formula of the Patman bill would allow one more uncontrolled-price sale of an old house. But it would prevent increases after that. The proposed cost-plus formula for new construction presents administrative difficulties. But they are not insuperable. Granting their imperfection, these rules should go into effect unless O.P.A. is all ready with better ones.

—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

HOUSING CONTROLS

Mr. Snyder's report to the President on the housing situation does not exaggerate the seriousness of shortages of dwellings. Obviously, energetic action of public authorities is needed to provide all possible additional facilities, particularly for returning veterans who require homes of their own.

When the President and Mr. Snyder, however, go to the length of proposing that Congress pass legislation to impose ceiling prices on new and used dwellings, they must expect to encounter serious opposition. Long before the war ended, the building industry was regarded as one of the outstanding reliances for leading this country to new heights of prosperity in the post-war era. The conclusion was logical because it was based on an assumption that the very situation of extreme shortage which the President and Mr. Snyder now emphasize would appear once the war ended and veterans began to return home.

If this urgent need for new housing and renovation of old structures is to be met in the quickest possible time, contractors and builders must have incentive to go ahead. What they naturally insist upon is a free market. For it is only in such a market

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the logical reward of better profits can be realized by men who have the initiative, the imagination and the resolution to take risks.

If there is to be a government-controlled market, wherein selling prices are rigidly fixed, the builders willing to plan daringly and take reasonable risks will find themselves reduced toward the same level of their brethren who are so cautious and unimaginative as to let the opportunity of great demand and limited supply pass them by. The logical consequence of such a policy could well be that some houses might be cheaper to buy than would otherwise be the case. But it could also easily be that there would be far fewer houses to sell at any price.

This part of Mr. Snyder's proposal and the President's endorsement of it poses squarely the issue whether, now that the war is ended, this nation intends to continue government controls in vital economic sectors or is resolved to restore a free economy.

It will always be possible for men in authority to discover some emergency and cite it as a cause for restrictive action on the hopes and ambitions of free men. But that was not the way America grew to economic greatness. And it is a poor introduction to an avowed policy of the present Administration to return to a free economy wherein men will find incentive to produce.

—*The Providence Evening Bulletin*

THE HOUSING STORY

We must at once start to build for the million and a half veterans and their families who need, or will shortly need, homes and haven't got them; for the 3,000,000 families who are living doubled up; for the 7,000,000 in substandard dwellings; for the 225,000 families who have been or will be evicted before the end of the year (compared to 73,000 in 1943). We must build most of these houses at a price of $5,000 or less, for that is the maximum amount that two-thirds of the home-needing population can pay.

How well does the Truman program fit into this picture?

It attempts to rectify the grave mistake made by the administration on October 15, when it scrapped L41, the WPB order which channeled available housing materials into the construction of dwellings costing $8,000 or less. The day after L41 was revoked, one Washington builder raised the price on 50 new homes he had built, from $8,000 to $9,000.

It restores the priorities it lifted two months ago on housing materials. Fifty per cent of the materials are to be allocated to the production of units selling at $10,000 or less.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the Truman proposal is to work, there must be further amendment of the priorities system to ensure that the construction of really low cost units (the ones we need most) will not be neglected.

Coupled with that must come a rigorous price-policing program. Even the best plans in the world for encouraging low-cost housing will be stymied by runaway prices and the existing black market in building materials.

The Truman program does nothing about the financing of municipalities and private citizens so that they can take advantage of the freed materials. The President should therefore support the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. This non-partisan measure undertakes to finance the construction of 10 million homes in the next 10 years, by private builders where possible, and by aiding municipal projects where private builders fail to meet the demand.

There still remains the problem of holding madly-skyrocketing prices in the sale of new and old homes. A national Housing Administration survey found the prices of single family homes in some cities to be 42 per cent higher than they were in '40. The Truman proposal takes cognizance of this issue by giving its blessings to the Patman bill, now pending in the House Banking Committee. This bill sets forth a sound formula to fix such prices and gives teeth to the formula by providing penalties for violators.

The housing story is one of America's darkest pages. The Truman plan is a beginning, though. With the right amendments, with rigid enforcement of priorities and price ceilings, and with the passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft and Patman bills we may begin to emerge into the light within two or three years.

—*New York Post*

TRUMAN'S HOUSING PROGRAM

All but one of the several measures adopted by President Truman to alleviate the nation's housing shortage and provide living quarters for returned veterans are promising in nature.

The appointment of former Mayor Wilson W. Wyatt of Louisville as special housing expediter under the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion was especially fortunate.

By ordering the speedy release of government-owned surplus housing units and building materials for use in housing veterans and their families, the president has settled the question as to what disposition should be made of these units and materials.

Mr. Truman also acted wisely in ordering the restoration of simple priorities on building materials.

The wisdom of the third point in the program is less certain. It calls for the imposition of price ceilings on old and new homes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ceiling on old houses would be the price at which they are first sold after the passage of the necessary legislation and that on new houses would be such as to allow the contractor the same margin of profit for comparable units in his territory as in 1941.

But we believe the time has come for the government to realize that in the fight against inflation the emphasis must be shifted from price regulations to production. If every effort is put forth by the government to clear the way for full production, and these efforts are successful, the prices will take care of themselves. But so long as the emphasis is on price controls and especially where those controls tend to discourage production, the way is simply opened for black markets and more serious inflation.

—The Cleveland Plain Dealer

HOME PRICES AND HOUSING NEEDS

When a representative of the National Association of Home Builders says "I don't think people will be foolish enough to pay ridiculous prices for homes," he is talking through his hat.

Ridiculous prices have been paid before. They will be paid again, because, as the National Housing Agency says, in a statement on the President's ceiling price proposals, "many people" in desperation will pay almost any price for housing otherwise unobtainable.

A more telling objection to the President's plan for ceiling prices on new and existing homes is the fear expressed as to its practicability, not in theory, but in light of the limitations of the administrative mind.

The proposal recalls too vividly the multitude of blunders committed in war-time price and ration administration, and their effects, temporary and not so temporary, on the supply of commodities considerably less vital than housing.

It is true that a house and lot represent a complex of variables, as to quality, location, workmanship and what not, of markedly more complexity than any commodity to which the Government heretofore has turned its hand in regard to price control.

It is also true that very few and slight errors in the attempt to control prices of this complex article could blight production and extend the shortage interminably.

The need to hold prices down more effectively than any conceivable addition to the supply of housing is likely to do, can not be denied. If Congress obediently enacts a law responding to the President's proposal, it had better be good, and so had the quality of the administration with which the President will seek to carry it out.

—The Detroit News

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A lesson in elocution from babes and "buslings"

Get a Bus, Brothers

From the column "Topics of The Times"

IT is remarkable how much greater is the command of language exhibited by a high school co-ed on a radio program or by a woman conductor on a Moscow bus than by the spokesman for a huge labor union or by a former Secretary of War and Ambassador to China. For sheer felicity of style and impromptu coordination, there is simply no comparison.

Walter P. Reuther of the United Automobile Workers has a mental equipment that few will venture to question. But you find yourself wondering if the best he can do with the English language is faithfully typified in his interview with the General Motors representatives as recorded in the subjoined transcript.

"A corporation that has the money you have, (said Mr. Reuther) and you fellows sitting on top and enjoying every damn decent thing of life, everything money can buy and all these security and when a bunch of workers asks for their share of it you thumb your nose at them, tell them to go to hell, refuse to conciliate, refuse to bargain, refuse to negotiate, refuse to arbitrate * * * You haven't lost a damned red cent, and we will take it right down to the last bitter inch of the road, and when the plants open up, remember, part of it goes back into the plants."

If this were handed in as a freshman high school theme, you can just see what teacher would do with a red pencil to Mr. Reuther's obscurity and tautology and complete lack of cohesion between noun and predicate.

General Patrick Hurley, testifying against his enemies in the State Department, was a good deal sounder than Mr. Reuther in syntax and sentence structure, even if his temper was obviously under as high pressure as Mr. Reuther's. But even General Hurley's style is characterized more by vigor than by elegance. The chairman of the Senate committee asked whether a certain person had served under General Hurley in China. The answer was:

"Not under me! No, sir! If he had been I would have taken him out immediately. I couldn't control him."

And, in reply to another question, there came this rather breathless rejoinder from General Hurley's lips:

"I can do it. I'm not bluffing. All right, here she goes. Here she goes. Square yourself!"

We will not go into such details as to point out the familiar squinting construction which teachers of English composition abominate, when General Hurley says, "If he had been I would have taken." The

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing to stress in the foregoing samples is the limited vocabulary and the exaggerated staccato.

One cannot help making comparisons with our aforesaid high school speaker on the radio program. In reply to a question about youth's contribution to world peace, she declares without a moment's hesitation and speaking very rapidly:

"Youth must assume full responsibility for integrating the daily interests of the classroom and the home with the all-compelling exigencies of a post-war civilization on the global level."

Even faster was the reply of the sturdy conductor on the Moscow bus, when the inquiring reporter asked what she thought about the atomic bomb. She continued to ring up fares and said:

"It is merely a question of preventing the atomic bomb from falling into the hands of the Fascists who are far from exterminated but have only gone underground where they are biding their time for another assault on the democratic cause in general and the Soviet Union in particular, the first move in that direction being the far-flung campaign now being waged by the dark forces of reaction to drive a wedge between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Saxon powers, who need only hold fast to the friendship forged in the fires of war to defeat the machinations of the bloody-minded fascist underworld."

Saying which, the Moscow bus conductor signaled for a corner stop and went to the help of a woman with two big bundles of laundry and three small children, who were all wedged in the doorway; and our reporter was left pondering how virtually impossible it was to imagine Walter P. Reuther or General Hurley expressing themselves in such flowing legato. It just simply shows what a little experience on a radio program or collecting fares on a Moscow bus will do in the way of educating a person in the art of self-expression.

• Uncle Zeke, patriarch of a small Mississippi village, was asked why he enjoyed talking to himself.

"Firstly," said the old darky, "Ah laks to talk to a smart man; and secondly, Ah laks to hear a smart man talk.

—Wall Street Journal

• At Sadieville, Kentucky, a tourist once called to an old native of the village, "Hey, uncle! How far is it to Lexington?"

"I dunno, Mister; it used to be 'bout 25 miles, but th' way things has gone up around here, may be near 40 by now."

—Tracks

• A woman, cornering the great English lexicographer, gushed: "Oh, Dr. Johnson, I was distressed to find that you had included so many naughty words in your dictionary."

Johnson looked at her coldly and replied: "And I, madam, am distressed to learn that you looked for them!"

—Hoosier Motorist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We can help Italy in many ways

Aid for Italy

By Sumner Welles

From his column in The Chicago Sun

THE overthrow of the cabinet headed by Premier Ferrucio Parri was only one in a series of events indicating the grave crisis which Italy is undergoing. Unless remedial action is taken it is inevitable that conditions within Italy will become far more serious.

In the five months during which he held office, Premier Parri demonstrated his devotion to the cause of democracy as well as his capacity and patriotism.

But no Italian government, however liberal and capable it may be, will have much chance to succeed if the policy of the United States continues to be as sterile as it has been until now.

Italy still is governed under the terms of the Armistice of 1943.

The failure of the major powers to agree at London upon an Italian peace treaty and the consequent uncertainties with which the Italian nation is confronted, make any advance toward political stability well-nigh impossible.

For the same reasons, no start can be made in laying any solid foundation for the restoration of Italy's shattered economy.

Even local—or communal—elections have not been yet held. Until the long-promised, and long-postponed, evacuation of British troops from northern Italy is carried out, no free elections can take place in that great industrial section.

The Italian government has as yet been unable to obtain the passage of a national electoral law. Yet national elections are scheduled to take place on April 30 next.

The internal situation in Italy is fast degenerating into one of hopeless confusion. In the meantime, the reactionary groups are plotting to obtain power. Fascist elements are fast coming to the surface. The strident voices of the extreme left are making themselves ever more loudly heard.

The inability of Italy to secure the peace treaty promised at the Potsdam conference is due primarily to the opposition of Soviet Russia.

The Soviet Union is opposed to the conclusion of any final peace treaty with Italy until some agreement can be secured from Great Britain and the United States upon the peace treaties with the eastern European and Balkan countries which Moscow favors.

So long as no Italian peace treaty can be concluded, the Italian people are left in the dark as to their frontiers and as to the final disposition to be made of Italian colonies.

They are left in equal doubt as to the extent of the reparations which their prostrate nation ultimately will be forced to pay.

© 1945, by The New York Tribune, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet Union has reduced its original demand to $300,000,000. The government of Marshal Tito is claiming $2,000,000,000. Greece, the country most entitled from every standpoint of equity to receive reparations from Italy, has not yet been able to formulate her demands.

Until the Italian people have these staggering uncertainties resolved, it is impossible to conceive of any political, economic or financial reconstruction.

By the terms of the United Nations declaration, the United States cannot conclude any unilateral peace treaty with an Axis power. There is consequently no hope that a peace treaty with Italy can be signed until some general understanding is reached between the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States.

On the other hand, there is much that the United States can unilaterally do to ameliorate the desperate condition in which the Italian people find themselves.

The winter already has set in. Many hundreds of thousands of Italians will confront cold and starvation unless relief—and immediate relief—is offered them.

All of Italy's pre-war merchant shipping has been taken for the inter-Allied pool. There is not the remotest chance of any inter-Allied agreement through which Italy could utilize some of these vessels to enable her to obtain food and fuel from abroad.

At the present moment, there are in the port of Buenos Aires 100,000 tons of wheat offered the Italian people as a gift by Argentina.

Quantities of food supplies can also be obtained by Italy in all of the eastern South American republics through credit operations guaranteed by the Italians resident in those countries. Yet without ships none of these supplies will become available.

The Allied Control Commission is still dominating every aspect of Italy's political and economic life. Until a final peace treaty is signed the Allied governments must necessarily exercise general supervision over the foreign policy of Italy, as well as over her finances and her armed forces.

But there are innumerable restrictions over Italy's domestic affairs still being enforced by the Allied Control Commission, which could long since have been safely lifted. Their continuation impedes any start forward to normal life.

The United States could of its own initiative solve all of these problems at once.

Empty American Liberty ships are already crowding our harbors. The charter of a number of them to the Italian government would not only help to save many lives. It would also make it possible for industry to recommence and for unemployment to be reduced.

Such assistance as this, and such evidence of practical sympathy, would make it more likely that the majority of the Italian people would be encouraged to unite in order to transform Italy into a constructive and democratic factor in the regeneration of Europe. And this is the moment when American help might well prove to be decisive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Orb Weaver

Here is the spinner, the orb-weaver,
Devised of jet, embossed with sulphur,
Hanging among the fruits of summer,

Hour after hour serenely sullen,
Ripening as September ripens,
Plumping like a grape or melon.

And in its winding-sheet the grasshopper.

The art, the craftsmanship, the cunning,
The patience, the self-control, the waiting,
The sudden dart and the needled poison.

I have no quarrel with the spider
But with the mind or mood that made her
To thrive in nature and in man's nature.

ROBERT FRANCIS

* * *

Eagle

Strong bird, if we could have your strength without your violence,
Your elm-wide wings, your unfailing flight without your crooked hands
And your hook'd beak, if we could have your mountains and your seas
Silent without your scream and the battle cries of all the Caesars,
If high were not aloof, if free were more than unconfined,
Strong bird, you would be stamped on something better than our gold.

ROBERT FRANCIS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South can't have its cake and eat it too

The South Must Decide

By Ralph McGill

From his column in the Atlanta Constitution

SENATOR Lister Hill made a plain, strong speech in Chicago. He was talking to the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau.

"Parity of opportunity for rural children" was his theme. He used the word to play on the setting of farm prices at "parity."

He lined up some facts, as follows:

"Three out of every 10 children are being raised in farm homes . . . yet of the nation's income only one dollar of every 10 goes to provide for those homes . . . a parity of health and educational opportunities for rural children is essential.

"Four out of every 10 counties in the United States do not have a recognized hospital. Practically all these counties are rural.

"The hope for adequate standards lies in the hospital construction bill, now en route to a house vote. . . . It provides for federal grants to assist local communities in building hospitals and medical centers.

"Indiana pays school teachers an average annual salary of $1,606 and Alabama pays an average of $929. Georgia is about the same.

"The farmers send millions of their dollars out of rural sections for purchase of automobiles, farm machinery and other manufactured goods. . . . The only way the rural sections can get back some of these farmers' dollars is by the federal government collecting some of the farmer dollars and sending them back to the farm sections through federal aid for education."

Every word he said is true . . . but not even the senator presents them as new. They are part of the south's plaint against tariffs which make the farmer sell in a free market and buy in a protected one. His farm machinery, made by the same labor, at the same cost, sells for less in Mexico, for instance, than in the United States.

The state of Connecticut, to select one of several for illustration, had added to its wealth, by tariffs alone, as much as the total income of the three lowest-income southern states. Millions of southern and western farm dollars went for machinery and tools and their "protection." The same might be said of several industrial states.

But it is necessary to tell the rest of the story. The south has got to make up its mind. It cannot have its cake and eat it, too. It cannot ask for government aid in one field and decry government aid, or "interference," in another. It was all right to build schoolhouses and courthouses for poor counties. But it was an invasion of state's rights to build homes for poor people.

© 1945, by the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Georgia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is human nature, but it butters very little bread, to send delegations to Washington asking help from the great White Father when our public pants are ragged, but to shout about this "damnable bureaucracy" and this "totalitarian centralization of government in Washington" when some other federal project interferes with some privilege of our own.

It doesn't make sense to be willing to surrender every right when "aid" suits us and then to make fiery speeches about "rights" and "traditions" when it doesn't suit us. It is human nature. But not good sense.

There are other figures Senator Hill could have used in his speech. Let's look at them.

The south had 50 per cent of its draftees rejected because of poor health. The percentage outside the south was 35 per cent.

The percentage of southerners over 25 years of age with less than five years' schooling is 24.9 per cent. Outside the south the percentage is 10 per cent.

The percentage of southern houses not wired for electricity is 50.4 per cent. The percentage outside the south is 18.8 per cent.

Yet, when a federal measure is up to guarantee a certain national minimum wage in industry there are plenty of southerners up making speeches and writing editorials saying, "Pay our people less."

There are plenty of small towns which are so held they won't let improvements or new industry come in. They don't want competition, and they don't want welfare or a hospital. They want to maintain a lock on the exploitation of their towns, and they do a good job exploiting and keeping out competition or any improvement.

They fight the Farm Security Act because it enables a tenant to leave and own his own place.

They do a fine job of juggling federal aid which benefits them and fighting federal "interference" which they figure will prevent them from making a dime more. They oppose paying a southern worker as much as a northern worker.

Senator Lister Hill was correct.

The south, with the most children of any section, ought to have federal aid for education on the basis of need . . . that is, on the basis of children to be educated. Yet, many of our people fought it.

We ought to have federal aid in building rural hospitals . . . on the basis of need and on the basis of robbery of the rural peoples by industrial protective tariffs.

But the south has got to make up its mind. It can't run with the hare and hounds; it can't have its cake and eat it too.

• From a Philadelphia real estate ad:

"'This house is too large for the lot. There is considerable waste space and the second floor is badly planned for the average family. The kitchen is dark and out of date and not much can be done about it.

"There are stains on some of the hardwood floors which you cannot get out.

"These are all of the bad things we know about and we still say we have never offered more livable housing for $11,950."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM: WHO IS RESPONSIBL

THE SCHOOLS!

By Charlotte C. Pardee

THOUSANDS of illiterates among inductees—that is what the Army has found. It is no secret, but it has not yet received great publicity, and it gives a jolt to most Americans who hear it. The immediate response is "I thought we had compulsory education. What is the matter with our schools?" This is a question which the schools must answer.

What, then, is the extent and nature of the problem? F. L. Schlagle, President of the National Education Association, is quoted by *Newsweek* as saying in April, "350,000 registrants in the draft signed their names with a mark. The education of 1,704,000 men . . . is below the standard of induction; in some states 12 out of 100 were rejected for illiteracy." A modern soldier, to be an effective combatant—and, in fact, merely for his own protection—needs at least a rudimentary knowledge of the three R's. Yet to reject all the illiterates would be to lose too many fighters. Consequently, as far back as 1940, the Army started a training program to meet the situation. In 1943, Special Training Units were established at Reception Centers. Here these men received two or three months of academic work. When drafting was at its height, there were 24 of these units scattered through the country, and a number still remain. More than 250,000 men have been through these schools.

Although it is obvious that the total number of "illiterates" is a small percentage of the total adult population, it is equally obvious that Americans, with their high standards in such matters, consider the number too great.

This remains true, in spite of certain moderating facts. One of these is the Army's use of the term "illiterate." Roughly, the Army so designates those unable to pass reading tests of about fourth grade difficulty. While there is no information to be had concerning the number who literally could not read a word in any language—the interpretation generally given to the word "illiterate"—we do know that these men form a small proportion of the whole. Any comfort in this is, however, dissipated by the knowledge that practically none of these men read well enough to meet adequately the demands for normal, not to say intelligent, living in this country. For instance, few of these men can clearly grasp the language of the ordinary newspaper, even when they can "read" it. Even "advanced" groups, for example, have needed considerable explanation for such words as *determined,*

(Continued on page 530)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR AMERICAN ILLITERACY?

THE COMMUNITY!

By Helen Faust

THE discovery by the Army of thousands of illiterates among inductees may come as a shock to the American public. An additional statement that the education of over a million and a half men is below the standard for induction may be a jolt to the rosy faith of those among us who are comfortable in the belief of American superiority in all fields. These facts, however, are not surprising to any who work in public education. Those who work in education or in any of the social services recognize certain deficiencies and are eager to talk about them to all who will listen. They are eager to talk because they believe that if Americans know the facts of any disagreeable situation, their energies will be stirred and directed toward improving that situation.

Illiteracy and substandard education offer a great challenge, not primarily to the public schools, but to the citizens to whom the schools belong. Certainly these facts point out one of our most vital post-war problems and suggest one area for development which will, among other things, provide a large number of employment opportunities. The ideal of universal education is a glorious one, but certainly not an easy one to accomplish in a nation as large as ours. If Americans want to wipe out illiteracy and to raise the educational standards of their people, a way can be found to do it. We have energy, resources and leadership, but we have not yet focused all these powers upon our educational problems. We have never set ourselves to tackle them as we have so recently concentrated our energies on the production of planes and guns and war materials. If we were to give but a fraction of the thought, work and capital investment to any social problem that we have given in the war emergency to production problems, who can dream what the results might be!

Wide-spread publicity should certainly be given to the findings of the Army relative to illiteracy, but it is equally urgent that we take a look beneath the surface of these figures to discover reasons for them. It would certainly seem imperative that an investigation be made of at least a large and representative sampling of these men whose education falls below Army standards. It could not be less profitable nor as costly as many of our famous investigations.

If such a study disclosed that these men on the average came from

(Continued on page 535)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 528)

dealing, adapting, industrial, unconditional. Their ignorance of the history, geography and government of even their own country is monumental.

To whatever satisfaction there may be in the fact that not all of these men are totally illiterate may be added another that makes the overall picture of the numbers requiring "special training" less grim. Some of the trainees are foreign-born and have only recently arrived in this country, or at least have had most of their education elsewhere. There are also some special cases. In New England there is a group of native-born, but of French-Canadian parentage, who have met the legal requirements of receiving part of their education in English, but who, during the greater part of their lives, especially at home and at work, use French exclusively. The earlier they leave school—and most of those who are assigned to Special Training Units leave as early as possible—and the longer they have been out, the more completely have they forgotten what little English they ever knew.

The matter of general intelligence is not so pertinent as it might seem. While the bulk of men referred for this training are somewhat below average intelligence, at least by Army tests, practically none are of a calibre so low that they are unable to learn. Indeed, this is the meaning of the term "functional illiterate" by which the Army designates these men. It is generally acknowledged that even those of distinctly limited mentality can grasp at least the fundamental mechanics of reading. The Army therefore assumes that men of mental abilities too low for reading and writing would not make good soldiers, and consequently rejects them at induction centers, or, if they escape this screening, a little later.

ILLITERATES OFTEN INTELLIGENT

Moreover, the performances of some of these men are plainly not those of the severely mentally retarded. Take the case of Rogers. At the time of his induction he was a foreman in a ship yard. He could not read or write, but he could handle eight or ten men. Where the names of parts were used on blueprints he memorized the numbers also employed to designate them, and so "read" these papers when required to do so. When it was necessary to write reports he dictated them to his wife at night. By such devices he was able to keep his employers in ignorance of his illiteracy and so hold his well-paid job. Another trainee owned and operated a successful trucking business. Still another boasted of the house he had built. Many "graduates" of Special Training Units have made excellent military records. These are plainly not the histories of hopelessly stupid men.

All this evidence makes it impossible to say that these men are too retarded mentally to learn to read. Yet some are known to have been in "opportunity classes" and one cannot help wondering if the schools did not so regard many of these students. If so, a more careful study of poor readers is in order.

The fact is the great majority of those enrolled in Special Training

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Units do learn. While percentages vary at different times and places throughout the country, it can be said that more than 80 per cent of those completing the courses pass the War Department's final test. Frankly, this still leaves many in an ill-defined borderland between what is generally considered "literate" and "illiterate," and the cry is always for more proficiency. But no one pretends that the Army course carries these men to the limit of their abilities. Arguments revolve only around "how much" and "how fast." Even those who do not "qualify" on the Army's test usually show definite improvement. Indeed, some soldiers, both among those who did and did not "qualify," back from the fighting fronts, have found a chance to continue studying in a convalescent hospital, and have definitely proved that they can progress still further. Moreover, the fact that the Army, since its first tentative classes, has greatly expanded the Special Training Unit program speaks for itself.

We come again, then, squarely against the problem: Why are so many men deficient in reading and writing? If the Army can teach them, why didn't the public schools do so?

When this question is casually put in New England the answer is almost invariably—with, it must be confessed, a touch of smugness—"Oh, I suppose all the trainees come from the southern mountains." Deep concern follows when these people are told that New England has a Special Training Unit of its own. The same phenomenon occurs when mention is made of the Special Training Class at the Camp Edwards Convalescent Hospital. Most of the soldier-patient-students there come from New England, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

While it may be true that there are more illiterates in some parts of the country than others, the problem is not essentially a sectional one. The under-educated are in every state, and, whatever the proportions, there are in every state too many.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM A FAILURE

Looking over the situation, then, there is no escaping the fact that, in this respect, our educational system has failed. The seriousness of its failure may be a matter of opinion, but failed it has. Why?

For the foreign educated, the schools are not responsible. Indeed, many of these men are testimony to the excellent work of the night schools. The case of the American-educated but foreign language groups, like those of French-Canadian extraction, is only partly an educational matter. Fundamentally it is a social problem. The intent of the law is obviously that these citizens shall be "literate" in English, while permitting the greatest possible educational freedom. In the case of those men who appear at Special Training Units the law has failed of its purpose, but whether this is a widespread condition is a matter for separate investigation.

Is the difficulty that compulsory attendance laws have not been properly enforced? To some extent, yes. The problem is greater in some sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the country than in others, but wherever it exists surely a determined effort should be made to solve it.

However, even if every child had received the full training to which he was legally entitled, we should still need Special Training Units. Many trainees have had as much as six or seven years in American schools, and some even more. Yet these men are "illiterate." It is to this group that attention is especially invited.

Why can't schools do at least as well with them as the Army has?

That the schools are not indifferent to their responsibilities every educator knows. This is especially true in view of the large numbers of successful remedial reading classes and reading clinics in operation in recent years. No doubt in many of them the teaching is as good or better than in the Army classes.

In this connection it is only fair to both the public schools and the Army to note that the aims of the two are different. The school classes take their place in the general educational program to adjust or re-adjust the student as a person and to enrich his mental life. They exist to serve the individual. The Army classes, on the other hand, aim solely at producing satisfactory soldiers. He is a rare trainee, for instance, who would not benefit personally by more instruction than the Army provides for him. Parenthetically, the sight of what teaching could and must not do for these men is one of the little tragedies of the war. There was Petrone, for instance, who one day came into the classroom to report with shining eyes that he had "dug out" a magazine article entirely by himself. Before he could get beyond "digging out" he had to learn to "dig in." And it is small consolation to a teacher to know that he attained his ambition to become a paratrooper.

The discrepancy of standards makes even an estimate of the relative teaching competence in the schools and the Army impossible. But let it be firmly stated that there is nothing to show that the Army has had to do the schools' remedial work because the schools are incompetent to do it.

The difficulty is that in many school systems there just isn't any remedial work, nor do "opportunity classes," where they exist, fill the need. Here, then, is a lead toward a possible improvement in the situation. Would it not be well for school systems, especially rural schools, to consider the matter of increasing the instruction in remedial reading?

DEFICIENCIES SHOULD BE PREVENTED

But even this is not the heart of the matter. As educators have been crying for some years, why is there so great a need for *remedial* training? Why cannot more of these deficiencies be prevented? A study of the causes given for reading disability leads straight to the conclusion that most students who learn to read by remedial methods could have learned to read when first instructed. If this is accepted there is no ducking the fact that many, probably most, reading deficiencies could, and therefore should, be prevented. Surely this is something Americans have a right to expect of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools. The result of our Army experience should be a determined and widespread program to increase the effectiveness of reading instruction in the early grades.

Much is already being done. Can we not do more? Can we not learn to adapt methods to the needs of different children? Learn more about better methods? Revise our salary scales to attract better qualified teachers to the work? Abandon some of the petty bickering in this field for more whole-hearted research? Abandon the practice of "pushing children along" (one soldier had 12 years of education) in favor of really constructive training? A heightened effort might at first cost more money and teacher-time, but in the end this should be balanced by a reduction in remedial classes, especially if these should be increased to meet present demands. And what about a balance with the expense of Special Training Units? Moreover, if the aim of school education is the fuller development of the individual, who can say when the cost of a successful program would be too great?

Consider Martin. In his Army classroom he was mild, quiet, attentive, hardworking. But little by little his school experiences came out. It was the old story of failure, bitterness, truancy, another try, another failure, and then a teacher who finally became exasperated by what he evidently considered deliberate "stupidity." He finally struck his pupil, who promptly struck back. Thereupon the pupil again left school, and it is my guess that the truant officer did not look too hard for him. Anyway, there was no more school for Martin.

Amazingly, he came out of this experience sufficiently well balanced to acknowledge freely that he had done wrong, in spite of the provocation, to adjust well to Army life and make another honest try at learning to read. But what could a suitable education have done for such a boy?

And the stories do not always have such happy endings. A boy, Campbell, with a similar record of failure and truancy, had become so set against school and all the humiliating and painful experiences which it symbolized, that he refused to make any effort to learn. Forced by the Army to attend a Special Training Unit, he went A.W.O.L., drank, was impudent, committed all the petty military misdemeanors on the calendar. Eventually, he had to be removed. Who knows when his misdemeanors will cease to be "petty?"

All this brings us to another aspect of the matter. Campbell's attitude is, somewhat surprisingly, but most fortunately, rare. Most of these men deserve the greatest respect for the courage with which they face and strive to overcome their handicap.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than at the Special Training Class at the Camp Edwards Convalescent Hospital. Here compulsion and pressure are at a minimum. So also are any rewards other than the sheer satisfaction of accomplishment. Yet men—and it is important to remember that they are men, not boys—come to these classes. They face up to what is often an obviously bitter task in admitting they "could never get beyond

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the third grade," "had to get a buddy to write all letters home," "missed the chance to be made a foreman," "always asked for the 'Special' so the waiter wouldn't know that I couldn't read the menu." They work patiently and earnestly on the most elementary drills, glorying in little accomplishments. Sometimes they come in for extra work, or take back work to the barracks. Sometimes when they get their Army discharges they ask to take their books home. These men want to learn.

CHALLENGE TO NIGHT SCHOOLS

Giving such veterans a chance to learn is one more thing educators can do. The G.I. Bill of Rights does not apply to them, since, in most cases, it would obviously be impractical and unwise to put grown men in elementary schools with children. Many are turning to relatives—usually their wives—for help. But many are looking to the only other suitable and widely available opportunity, the night school.

Among those enrolled at Special Training Units and at the Special Training at Camp Edwards are many former night school students, and beyond question there are hundreds more throughout the Army. It is evident that the night schools have done a fine piece of work for these foreign educated. Now, whenever one of these under-educated veterans comes to them they have a different problem—different because, as teachers will be quick to see, these men need a different technique and approach. Americans look to them to continue their successes.

These illiterates want to become literate. Has the Army supplied a motivation the schools do not? Is that the secret, the answer to the question; if the Army does, why didn't the schools? Partly, for it appears these men do have a motivation lacking in remedial classes. They have the maturity that comes from working for a living against odds. They have discovered that merely leaving school did not bring them the satisfaction they wanted. Also, the subject matter at Special Training Units, being military, is of immediate importance to all of them. Furthermore, at Special Training Units they are somewhat protected from the unjust and unjustified competition they must often meet in schools. The difference in drive is, however, only relative and applies largely to the remedial classes at about junior high school level.

Furthermore, remedial classes, as was stated before, do not get at the core of the problem. The eagerness of these soldiers to learn is only the adult counterpart of the eagerness of children. Children now, in these United States, almost invariably want to learn to read—until their enthusiasm is dampened by failure. The schools have the same primary motivation to work on that the Army has. If and when they spoil it, that is a failure.

What, then, *is* the answer to the illiteracy appearing in the Army? Certainly it is not that these individuals are unteachable. Only partly does it appear to be a matter of special problems in certain sections of the country. Lack of enforcement of the school laws accounts only to a limited extent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the situation. Special motivation and any unusual excellence of instruction in the Army can be held only partly responsible. Even all these partial answers together do not account for a certain large group. We are faced with the fact that elementary education, throughout the nation, has been unsuitable for many pupils, and has failed to teach them adequately.

Therein lies the challenge to the schools. Let them throw their characteristic will to progress, energy and imagination squarely against this grave and difficult problem.

(Continued from page 529)

families of regular incomes, had had normal wholesome family lives, had been of good health in mind and body during childhood, and had lived in communities provided with schools of average standards, the high illiteracy figures would almost necessarily be a terrific indictment of American schools. It seems much more probable, however, that one or several of these qualifications were missing from the lives of these men during their school years. It seems almost obvious to anyone who has worked in schools or with large numbers of people that these men are apt to represent the sum of all who were problem children in their various communities or came from communities with totally inadequate schools.

COMPLEXITY OF EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

When public education is evaluated, there is an understandable, but still grievous error in the failure to understand the complexity of the process of education. Anyone who travels around the country at all knows that there are school buildings in almost every community. There are thousands of very fine buildings. But, perhaps, one of our most serious errors has been to assume that by constructing a fine building, we can educate the youth of that community. The building is useless if it is not staffed with a sufficient number of good teachers. (More about that later!) Then, in order to profit by these educational plants, children must be inside them. True, we have compulsory attendance laws. But a law without strong enforcement is not an instrument of much power. Enforcement is commonly left to the schools themselves, but seldom is the school provided with sufficient funds to carry out this part of their program. In larger communities, the courts cooperate in extreme cases after the schools have tried every way within their resources to win or compel regular attendance. But, for example, in one relatively progressive community, cases of extreme absence which reach the courts after weeks or months of delay are penalized by fines of less than three dollars. Not very effective action!

Why should children stay away from school? We somewhat sentimentally think of children as a group ready and eager to learn. For most well-cared-for children this is undoubtedly true. Regular school attendance is a comparatively simple matter in well regulated families with incomes adequate for proper feeding, clothing and medical care. It is simple when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents are anxious that their children should have good educations even though this involves some parental sacrifice. However, tragically, as we well know, there are many thousands of families for whom the complexities of living are too great to afford the luxury of ambition for their children. There are broken homes. There are sick, ignorant, poor or brutal parents. There are unwanted children and children abandoned by their parents to the care of unloving relatives. Attendance laws are not effective for such children.

Take the case of William, whose father has always drunk too much, using the major part of his income for this indulgence. William's mother is years younger than his father and rarely faithful to him. She is "away" much of the time. William never received much parental care and began selling newspapers when he was very young. Being on the street was much preferable to being in such a home. Tired and unhappy always, he never attended school regularly and learned very little when he was there.

Or Doris, whose mother has babies as fast as biological law permits, who is incompetent to take care of a family and cares more about having help with the oncoming babies than in having those of school age attend regularly. Do either of these two children have a chance for anything but a substandard education? These are not rare cases. There are thousands like them.

The American people know that there are staggering social problems of poverty, poor housing, alcoholism, sexual irregularities and illness. But perhaps they have not fully realized the close connection between these problems and education. The American people who want to prevent illiteracy must recognize the destructive power of these social ills, and feel the urgency of supplying the school with supplementary services adequate to compel attendance. This involves necessarily the expansion and co-ordination of community services equipped to grapple with these various social diseases.

LEARNING DIFFICULT FOR MANY

Adequate enforcement of the attendance laws will help, but not solve the problem of educating all the educable children. Even when these children for whom attendance is so difficult are compelled to be in school, they find learning a more involved process than their comrades who come from good homes. The deep-seated emotional problems which so often result from these conditions greatly complicate the learning process. These children do not learn as easily as those not so handicapped.

There are other factors which make learning difficult. Visual defects and other physical handicaps may go undetected for many years even in families which have every desire to help their children. This is particularly true in small towns or rural areas where health services are inadequate. Complicated emotional problems can develop even among the best-cared for children. When learning is retarded in the early grades for any reason, discouragement and humiliation become additional impediments. Falling behind others of the same age either in the grade to which they are assigned or in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quality of the work they can do exaggerates learning difficulties unless remedial work is offered. To detect and to understand these obstacles to learning, the school requires the help of competent doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists when the difficulties first appear. To teach children suffering from these difficulties, even when they are understood, requires special methods and the time for individual work.

A tremendous amount of excellent research has been done in this field by American psychologists and educators. Unfortunately the results of this work have not been put to wide-spread use. There are several reasons for this. The community may be too small to afford these specialized services, and there is a lack of trained personnel to do them. Very often the diagnostic and remedial work appears as a costly extra to school boards which are more interested in low costs than they are in the best possible education for the children of their communities. There are always certain interests in the community which fight to keep school costs low. Parents and teachers have not shown themselves to be an articulate lobbying group to secure the funds necessary to carry out a complete educational program.

A large and successful industry concentrates its attention on the standards of the product with which it is concerned. With education, as with other public programs, the main focus of responsible authorities is too often on finance. Boards of education do not commonly ask for annual reports on the real progress of the pupils for whom they are educational guardians. They do not ask for figures on the number of children who are not successful in meeting minimum educational standards nor do they demand exploration into the causes of these failures. Supervision of the schools is a community function which has not generally been visualized in the broad terms necessary to secure for every child an education commensurate with his capacity to learn.

POSITION OF TEACHERS

It is undoubtedly true that an investigation of the substandard education discovered by the Army would reveal that another cause for it could be traced to inefficient teaching. This again is a problem for the nation as a whole to examine and relates directly to the present shortage of teachers throughout the country. Educators have foreseen this emergency and have tried to attract qualified high school graduates to Teacher Training Colleges. They have not been very successful. It is rare to hear a high school student who is thinking about his choice of a vocation say that he wants to be teacher. At present, even the most progressive school systems are lowering their standards of eligibility for new teachers. This condition should awaken the sharpest concern in the minds of Americans who look to their schools not only for training in the three "R's," but also for the preparation of youth for the handling of the most complex problems the world has ever known. We put great faith in education, but there as elsewhere "faith without works" is a sentimental emotion. If the people of this country want

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools equipped to educate all youth, we will have to work at it and be prepared to pay for it.

It is strange that if a parent thinks a school is doing a poor job, he grumbles or tries to pay for private school. If the same parent buys a radio or a piece of furniture which is defective, his action is direct and decisive. He makes a complaint and secures an adjustment. If he wants a suit of clothes which will fit him perfectly and wear well, he will choose a good tailor and the best available material. Although the initial cost is somewhat higher, he is convinced that in the long run, the suit will be less expensive than one made of inferior materials by less capable workmen.

We are not so thoughtful about our program of public education. In 1945, we shall spend about $2,500,000,000 for education. This is a small amount when it is compared with some other expenditures. For example, we are willing to spend a billion dollars more than this amount for our alcoholic beverages. We are willing to spend twice this amount for our recreation. In 1942, it was estimated that we spent about $2,300,000,000 for education and a little more than this amount for tobacco and smoking supplies. We spend about two-thirds as much for cosmetics as we do for education. It is rather commonly recognized that we get about what we are willing to pay for so far as material things are concerned. Do these figures mean that we Americans consider our smoking, our drinks or our fun worth more than the education of our children?

If we translate these figures into more specific terms, perhaps they will largely explain teacher shortages and teaching inefficiency. In the current year of high wages, there are over 25,000 teachers who will receive less than $600 for their teaching. There are 200,000 who will receive less than $1,200 for the year's work. Approximately half of the teachers in the nation will receive less than $1,800. These figures require little comment to show why there is a shortage of teachers and why those who are teaching are not always well-qualified persons.

LITTLE PERSONAL SATISFACTION

Some may say that the satisfactions of teaching offset the small financial gain. It is axiomatic that satisfaction in any type of work is derived largely from a sense of the achievement of certain desired ends. Can the teacher earn this reward under existing conditions? Imagine a classroom with from 30 to 50 children in it. Let us suppose it is one of the elementary grades where the teaching of basic skills is so vital. The teacher finds a few bright pupils who move along without much help, but she realizes unhappily how much could be accomplished for these few if there were more time. There is another group who are slow learners and who for that reason tend to be very quiet or to be troublemakers. The reasons for their apparent resistance to learning cannot be determined without physical and psychological examinations. There is, of course, a middle group for whom most of the teaching is planned. Another section of the class is made up of pupils who are frequently absent and these need to have parental interviews or home visits.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some pupils are energetically aggressive and need control, while others are listless and need stimulation. Each segment, which is to say each child, needs far more help than she can give without the aid of certain supplementary services. A sensitive and capable teacher generally feels this keenly. She spreads her efforts as best she can but rarely knows the thrill of accomplishment. She usually ends the school year with feelings of frustration and exhaustion. The satisfactions of such a situation are extremely limited and this explains, in part, why the morale of teachers is probably lower than that of any other professional group.

Why then does any teacher stay in the field? That is a question asked more commonly among teachers than among any other occupational group. The asking of the question by older teachers is often effective in driving the younger, more idealistic ones from the profession. Many stay, of course, because they do hold on to a belief in the worth of their contribution and because they like teaching in spite of its difficulties. Others stay because the short hours and the vacations permit them to do other things which bring greater rewards. Some stay in the profession because of inertia or the lack of skills to do anything else. Tenure laws, which give teaching a greater security than some other fields, hold other men and women to the occupation.

What do Americans expect of a group half of whom are underpaid, a group so frequently ridiculed that many try to conceal their occupations when away from the job, a group who because of the complexities of their task know more of failure than of success? Do Americans really expect such a group not only to eliminate illiteracy, but also to train minds to think and act wisely in an age such as this one? The wonder is not that the schools have done so poorly, but that they have done so well.

However, it is a good time for Americans to look at their schools critically and to say clearly what results they expect. Leaders in education, aroused in part by the criticism of the Army and the Navy, have begun to examine their schools and to make lengthy and thoughtful statements directed toward their improvement. These studies are being discussed seriously by teachers everywhere. This is important, but it is equally urgent that the nation accept the responsibility for close cooperation and strong support in building better schools.

Expanding our schools to insure an adequate education for every child will require an expenditure of from somewhere between two and three times the amount we are now spending. A recent statement of the research division of the National Education Association sets $5,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 as the minimum requirement for a sound nationwide school program. Do we Americans really believe sufficiently in education to dictate to our legislatures that adequate sums of our money shall be appropriated for this purpose? This is the real challenge which arises from any criticism of our present school system.

• Money can be lost in more ways than won.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dawn days of the movies were rough

Scarred Veteran of the Screen

By Paul Jones

From his column in The Atlanta Constitution

BEN HILL is one movie press agent who knows whereof he speaks.

He served a rugged apprenticeship in films when stand-ins were scarce as hens' teeth, and he has many a scar on his noggin' to attest to a "saloon brawl" in one of the wild and woolly horse operas which were fashioned in the days of the two- and three-reelers of the 1916-1920 period.

Ben was an actor then; a handsome chap "with a lot more hair than he has now," and he had the pleasure of playing with a pretty little blonde girl named Mary Pickford, who Jesse Lasky then "thought would become one of the greatest actresses of the American theater."

Lasky guessed right about the lovely Pickford lass, for her career in the movies is now history, but Lasky missed the proverbial boat when he predicted that Hill would become a matinee idol in the movies —if he stuck with it.

That's the straw that broke the camel's back. The life was too rugged for the broad shoulders of Hill, now a press agent for United Artists Pictures, who, in an interview, recalled many of his interesting experiences in the old silent movie days.

"Those knock-down-drag-out fist fights, which we had to stage ourselves, occasionally catching a hard right on the chin, and the fast riding scenes in those old horse operas were too much for me," Ben remarked yesterday. "I find the exploitation end of the movies more pleasant, if not more profitable than the Hollywood end."

Hill entered the movies as a featured player in 1916 after serving as lecturer and guide on the famed British convict ship, "Success," on world tour.

His first flicker—and they flickered something terrible in those days—was "Trail's End," in which he played with Mary Pickford (she as a blind girl) and Mary Sarr, the "mother of the films," who later made the famous silent movie, "Over the Hill to the Poor House." Tex O'Reilly was the male lead in this movie.

"Tex and I had a fight sequence in that movie that I will never forget," Hill recalled. "The studio rented a vacant storehouse in which to film the scenes. It was furnished with tables, chairs and an old wood stove. The fighting got so intense that we broke all the chairs and tables over each other's head and turned the stove over, setting the place on fire. The studio had to

© 1945, by The Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Georgia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay for the storehouse; it cost more than the entire movie."

In between movies, Hill returned to his home in Texas and signed up with Francisco Madero's Mexican army as a soldier of fortune to help in overthrowing the infamous Diaz government. "Floyd Gibbons, world-famed correspondent, and Tex O'Reilly were along with me then, and the war came to an end as we were crossing the international bridge at El Paso."

After this, Hill returned to Hollywood, which then was only a small village, where "quickies" like "Borderland," "Mr. Biggs," "Squawman," "Welcome To Our City" and other horse operas were turned out in four to five days.

The late Tom Mix was a young cow puncher and took part in one of the films in which Hill had a featured role. An accompanying picture shows Hill standing at the bar (a Hollywood prop of course) with Mix and Yakima Canute, famous stunt director, whose specialty then was "throwing horses" in the hard riding scenes.

"Canute would stretch a piece of piano wire across the road where the horses were to come thundering down in a cloud of smoke and when the "'fall horse" got astride of the wire, Canute would raise the wire and throw the horse and rider to the ground."

Hill joined the press department of United Artists in 1934 after 14 years as city editor and managing editor of the *Dallas Dispatch,* and since then he has had many a hair raising experience in exploiting one picture and another.

Ben was called on to stage a stunt in exploiting a picture, "Splendor," in Texas at one time—a stunt that almost backfired.

"We obtained $240,000 in jewels from a local jewelry store and ran an ad in the paper for a 'queen' to sit on the throne of the local theater wearing the gems," Hill relates. "A beautiful girl answered the ad, we hired her, bedecked her in the jewels and sat her on the throne.

"On her last day as 'queen,' a detective from a neighboring city came with a summons, arrested her and told us she had just completed a nine year sentence in prison for jewel theft and was wanted at the time on a similar charge in Chicago. That's the last time I've employed a jewel stunt in promoting a picture."

But that doesn't compare with the time Hill was forced to get a pick and shovel and dig up 40 feet of pavement when another of his "gigantic" publicity stunts had backfired.

"I had hired a man to paint, in big lettering, a billboard poster about a new picture which was opening there on the pavement of a downtown street in El Paso," Ben recalled, "and the paint had hardly dried when a policeman awoke me at 2 a. m., handed me a pick and told me to dig up the entire street and destroy the poster which had been so artistically placed only a few hours hence."

But his brushes with the law, and the pick and shovel routine were never as rugged as those early days in the movies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nimitz and Eisenhower should write merger-plan

Needed: a Joint Plan

By Walter Lippmann

From his column "Today and Tomorrow" in the Portland Press Herald

THE controversy between the War Department and the Navy now has been argued sufficiently to make it quite plain that no plan of unification has yet been worked out which it would be wise for Congress to impose by legislation. Even supposing that the War Department blueprint is a good general sketch of what the military establishment ought to be like, it lacks the one element which is indispensable to any plan of unification which is likely to succeed. It is that the senior officers of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, are not joint authors of the plan. It is a War Department plan, and that in itself is, it seems to me, a conclusive objection to it.

The right plan, the plan which will in fact bring about the teamwork which General Eisenhower has described so convincingly, needs itself to be the product of teamwork. It should be drafted and sponsored jointly by the three services which are expected to work together under the plan. A shotgun marriage is a poor way to found a happy family. It is quite evident that if Congress imposed the War Department plan upon the Navy there would be legal administrative and formal unity: But a genuine unity, which must rest on conviction and consent, would be lacking. For we are dealing here not with inert materials that can be fitted and nailed together according to a blueprint but with proud and sensitive men, imbued with a great and glorious tradition. They must be persuaded and they should not be overridden. For unity is not to be achieved by issuing an order which they must obey. The unity which General Eisenhower wants, the only kind worth having, requires active and whole-hearted belief and not merely passive obedience.

The practical conclusion is, it seems to me, quite clear: The President, the Congress and the public should ask the three services to produce a joint plan; one which Patterson and Forrestal, Eisenhower, Nimitz and Spaatz are agreed upon; one which is as much the work of the joint staffs as were the plans of the combined operations during the war.

Some will say that the senior officers of the services are too far apart to come together on a joint plan. That it is too difficult for the services to agree on how they are to be united, that only by uniting them first can they be made to learn to agree.

There is weight in this argument. It is often true in human affairs, and it may be true here, that in order to get men to cooperate, they

© 1945, by The New York Tribune, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must find themselves in a position where there is no alternative but to cooperate. That would still not be a reason for making the War Department plan the law of the land. But it would be a reason for the President to make sure that the chiefs of staff were men who really wanted to agree on a joint plan.

As a matter of fact, in General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz the President has two chiefs of staff who meet these specifications. They have proved their capacity to bring about teamwork among the services, and certainly the President would not be asking too much if he directed these two men to work out a joint plan. What they had agreed upon, all could agree upon for if they were united on the plan, its prospects of success would by that fact alone be most favorable. They, as joint chiefs of staff, would put into operation a plan which jointly they had produced. No other plan, no matter how plausible it looked as a blueprint, would carry with it the same assurance of success.

The passionate and often acrimonious controversy between the two departments is in the last analysis due to the fact that the commander-in-chief did not lay down a clear rule requiring them to produce a joint plan. Perhaps no great harm has been done, perhaps even much good by allowing the matter to be debated freely. But now that everyone has had his say, there is no point in everyone's saying it again and again until no one is capable of changing his mind.

The appropriate time to end the debate, and make a new start, is now when General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz are taking over. It can serve no good purpose for them to carry on the old controversy which developed while they were abroad. They have come home to be the organizers of American military power in the post-war world, and the best place for them to begin is by adjourning the old debate and devoting themselves with fresh and uncommitted minds to the formulation of a joint plan.

• The worm may turn, but did you ever hear of it hurting anybody when it did?

• Said Dan James, playwright: "Taxes in Britain are especially hard on the nobility. They are selling their art treasures and landed estates. They are not as exclusive as they used to be.

"Perhaps they used to be too exclusive. In Queen Victoria's time, there was a great Tory peer of whom it was said his invariable rule was to decline to be introduced to anybody he didn't know."

—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*

• During the trial of Japanese General Yamashita in Manila several months ago, General Akiro Muto, a defense witness, was asked in cross-examination, "Do you speak English?" "No," he said. The roar of the spectators brought a vigorous rap of the gavel for order.

• The trouble with people who drink like fishes is that they don't drink what fishes drink!

—*Louisville Courier-Journal*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Give and take marked the conference

The Score at Moscow

By Arthur Krock

From his column "In the Nation" in The New York Times

THE text of the Moscow communiqué, though its directness of statement is occasionally blurred by legalistic language, quite clearly reveals these results of the conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and Russia in the Soviet capital:

1. The stalemate of London was broken and, in many respects, constructively.

2. Russia was successful in extending the veto reserved for permanent members of the United Nations Security Council to control of the activities of the atomic energy commission, the terms of all peace treaties and the governing of Japan and Korea. This subjects to the approval of the Big Five every major move in the world's complete transition from war to peace and defers the time when the United Nations Organization can take over on its proclaimed concept of the equality of nations, large and small.

3. The British have failed in their first effort to break down or modify the veto system when it was decided to put the atomic bomb commission under the full authority of the Security Council instead of the Assembly of the United Nations.

4. The United States and Great Britain were successful in broadening the terms of what shall be considered representative and democratic government in the Balkans, though the extent of Russia's yielding on this point must be measured by developments.

5. The United States, while accepting a control commission for Japan with specified authority over General MacArthur, the Supreme Allied Commander, inserted certain modifying phrases. These suggest that, by the exercise of its own veto in the commission, the United States can prevent changes in the directive from Washington under which the General is now proceeding, thus maintaining a *fait accompli* on many matters.

6. The absence from the text of any mention of Iran and Turkey, and the accompanying statement by Secretary Byrnes that all decisions reached were duly reported in the communiqué leaves Russian policy in those areas unchallenged for the present.

7. Similar omission of any reference to Indonesia leaves to the British and the Dutch, with the counsel of the United States, the formulation and development of policy in an area in which Russia has also expressed an interest.

8. The commission project for Korea, with its pledge of later independence for that people, fulfills the effort of the United States government to effect a smoother and safer

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working arrangement with Soviet Russia there.

9. The section dealing with China re-affirms United States policy, with its primary support of the government of Chiang Kai-shek, and sustains Moscow's pledge that it would not encourage the domination of China by the Yenan regime.

These results, in broad outlines, are far better than seemed in immediate prospect after the impasse at the London conference of the same Foreign Ministers. They fall far short of the aspirations of those who seek what they call a "true" world government, in which the surrender of the veto principle by the Big Five would be implicit. They will disappoint the devoted scientists whose fears that atomic energy will not be chained to the ways of peace are not allayed by the extension of the veto power of the permanent members of the Security Council to cover restraints on the work of the commission which a single great nation can exercise. For restraints could conceivably be set by a Big Five nation which was secretly building an atomic war machine.

But in the present state of the world that agreement had to be made, or each nation, including Russia, left free to develop atomic fission as a military weapon without violating a single international law or Big Five compact. And, as the history of the Council veto provision shows, prevailing sentiment in Congress would undoubtedly have opposed the surrender of veto authority by the United States over the U.N. atomic bomb commission, once it was decided to place its work under the Security Council. That was made abundantly clear, before Mr. Byrnes left for Moscow, by members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when they got the impression from the Secretary that he wanted to give Russia everything about the bomb's manufacture forthwith.

Great Britain alone, apparently sustained by most of the leaders of its two great political parties, was willing to take the chance on Russia and the future by leaving all atomic regulation to the Assembly, where no veto can prevail. This advance position may in time be reached by the United States and the Soviets. But each will require a great deal more reassurance about the foreign policies of the other and those of certain other nations before arriving at the point proposed by the British.

Therefore, the activities and recommendations of the atomic energy commission—dedicated in the Moscow communiqué to the "control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes"—can proceed only so far and in such directions as the Big Five on the Security Council shall unanimously approve. This unanimity is not mentioned in the document released recently. But it is the perpetual requirement of the U.N. Charter on "all other matters" than "procedural," and the Charter governs the Council's operations in dealing with any and all responsibilities entrusted to it.

• **Thrift is a wonderful virtue, especially in ancestors.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unsung actors return to the daily scene

Heroes Anonymous

By Charles Fisher

From his coulmn in the Philadelphia Record

A FRIEND remarked to us the other day that, despite the urgency of world and national news, a few old friends—anonymous, indomitable, heroic characters—have managed to get back into the papers again.

We checked for a few days, and sure enough there they were: The passerby who took the injured to the hospital after an accident. The neighbor who smelled smoke and gave the alarm when the house next door burned. The witness who saw a man's figure fleeing the scene of the crime. The pedestrian who remembered three digits of the hit-run driver's license number. The truck driver who extricated the occupants of the flaming coupe. And, yes . . . yes, even the policeman, the venerable policeman who fired three shots after a fleeing suspect.

Where have they been during the war years, we wonder? Have they been calling ambulances and Rescuing Three all the while? Have the papers just been too busy to report their doings? Or did they simply retire from active participation in civic affairs—most of them are too old for military service—until the papers would have room for their exploits again?

Whatever happened, we are delighted to see them functioning once more. We are particularly pleased to welcome the Neighbor Who Smelled Smoke. We know her almost as well as if we had met her. She is a plump, neat, matronly lady whose neuritis gives her trouble occasionally. That interferes with her sleep and, consequently, she is often prowling about the kitchen making herself a cup of tea at the time when fires begin. We don't know how many lives she has saved by pounding on walls—sometimes her husband helps by smashing a parlor window from the street—but we are glad to know that she has resumed operations. It is good to think of her moving restlessly through the night, alert for the first whiff of smoke.

The truck driver who tore open the door of the burning car is our next favorite. He, too, is middle-aged—a powerful, coarse, kindly man, one of the kind who pulls aside to let you pass on narrow roads. At the first crash of the wreckage or sign of flame he is out of his cab and into the middle of the mess. But once everyone is safe and the fire is out, he pushes aside rewards and climbs back into his truck.

"Forget it, Bud," he says. "I got this load to deliver."

The witness who saw a man's figure fleeing the scene of the crime is, we must admit, of a faintly more

© 1945, by the Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sinister aspect. He is youngish and thin and sallow, and he wears a long coat and a pull-down hat. He smokes cigarettes down close, holding them between the tips of his thumb and middle finger. And no one ever quite knows what business brings him out in the middle of the night. But you must grant him this: He's always on hand when the fugitive takes heel, and not infrequently he chases him a block or so. There must, then, be good qualities in the witness and, besides, without him how would we of the press know the incident wasn't suicide?

The man who takes the hit-run driver's number means well, but he is a blunderer, else he would get more than three digits. Nor would he describe the car simply as a "dark sedan." He would give its make and year as well. But police find him invaluable and he has been with us since the beginning of the automotive age. The only trouble is, we can't love him as well as the policeman who fired three shots at the suspect. Bless that policeman! He hasn't hit a thing in 30 years.

All in all, our friends make a selfless little group, never expecting to get their names into print, taking satisfaction only in doing their duty and then reading about themselves in anonymity. We'd like to do them some sort of favor in return. Maybe some day we'll go down to Washington and get the High Official Who Refuses to Be Quoted and have him organize them into a union.

Bowles formula is best

Why Extend Price Controls

By Samuel Grafton

From his column "I'd Rather Be Right" in the New York Post

THERE is a desperate note in Mr. Chester Bowles' voice as he argues for continued price control. He has tried everything; he has tried moral persuasion; he has tried to shock us by showing what chaos lies ahead if we give up price control; he has even tried giving control up, in bits and pieces, to see what would happen, with the result that juke boxes, when freed, jumped instantly from a price of $250 per unit, to $500, while oranges climbed in some mid-western places to a dime apiece, $1.20 per dozen.

When Mr. Bowles looks about for help, not much is forthcoming. The National Association of Manufacturers wants all price controls lifted by February 15. Republican members of the House and Senate have issued a broad statement of foreign and domestic policy, in which there is not a single reference to the danger of inflation, but, rather, the declaration: "Wartime limitations, restrictions and controls must be removed." When Mr. Bowles reads articles of this sort, 10 cent oranges float before his eyes.

© 1945, by the New York Post, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And with but few friends to sustain him, Mr. Bowles is in the unhappy position of being lobbied against, on a scale perhaps never before seen in this republic. The campaign against Bowles at the moment is certainly noisier, and almost certainly more elaborate, than the campaign against tuberculosis; he may even outrank traffic accidents in the amount of effort and public attention being devoted to his defeat.

Mr. Bowles says he does get "many" private letters of encouragement from business men who are members of the very organizations which are out after him; but these men are unable to stand up against the "hoopla," or, when they try to, are run over in the rush. The *Christian Science Monitor* has dug up one large-size San Francisco real estate man, Mr. Louis R. Lurie, who says publicly that if rent control vanishes, his income will be increased by $200,000 a year, without the need of an additional 50 cents of investment, and that he does not like this prospect, because he shudders to think what will happen to the country when $45 apartments go to $125. But, Mr. Lurie is a crowd of one; in news terms, the man who bit the dog.

Architecturally, the price control problem centers around two calendar dates. One is January 1st, when lower excess profits taxes went into effect; and both Mr. Bowles and Reconversion Director Snyder have charged flatly that quantities of goods, especially clothing, were being held off the market, for sale after that blessed date. The second critical calendar day is June 30, when all price control dies, unless Congress re-enacts the needed laws before; and Mr. Lurie, the rugged individualist quoted above, declares that speculators are planning their new building construction for after that date, when they hope no holds will be barred.

It is often said that price control is holding business back, but on the basis of the above information, one wonders if a case could not be made out to the effect that the prospect of removing price control is holding business back, and whether reconversion does not require that we settle the issue now, leaving speculators and calendar-watchers no magical dates on which to keep their eyes fixed, while their hand pauses and halts in its work.

Mr. Bowles' simple formula that price control must continue until supply is approximately equal to demand would seem the best basis for a national policy; far better than picking a date out of a hat. Why February 15? Why not Whitsunday? Why any day but the right day? And to settle the issue now would have the special virtue of convincing us all that our only way out is through work.

I know the mailman will shortly stagger in, loaded down with letters complaining about the unfairness of specific instances of price control, some of them sound and unselfish; but 10-cent oranges are unfair to babies, and $125 apartments are unfair to returning soldiers, and a democracy can work only by making choices among seeming unfairness, on the basis of the majority good; as we did, for example, in adopting selective service.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scientists make strides in many fields

'45—Year of Discovery

By Waldemar Kaempffert

From his column "Science in Review" in The New York Times

THE outstanding event not only of the year but in the whole history of science and technology was the splitting of the uranium atom, with consequences in Japan which have appalled physicists, statesmen and the common people. Indeed, so appalled were the physicists that they banded themselves into a federation which has been prodding congressional committees into a realization of what it means to release energy from the atom for good and evil. For the first time science has been shocked into an awareness of the social consequences of its discoveries. It is now either cooperation or vaporization, the millennium or destruction, or, as Louis Adamic puts it, "one world or no world."

In developing the bomb two new elements were formed — neptunium and plutonium. Both were known before 1945, but until the government spent two billions to achieve the bomb neither had been obtained in anything but microscopic amounts. The number of elements, once supposed to be 92, has been increased by four. Numbers 95 and 96 were discovered this year by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg by bombarding uranium and plutonium with high-energy helium ions.

A nova or new star was discovered in the constellation Aquila, the Eagle. It is 80,000 times brighter than our sun. Two shells of matter ejected by the nova are moving with velocities of about 1,300 and 800 miles a second.

Another nova, 100,000,000 times brighter than the sun, was discovered in Messier 51, famous spiral nebula in Canes Venatici.

There was a total eclipse of the sun on July 9, which was studied by astronomers in Montana, Canada, Norway, Sweden and the U.S.S.R.

New comets called du Toit III, du Toit IV and Friend-Peltier, after their discoverers, turned up. Comet Pons-Winneck and Kopff's periodic comet, both last seen in 1933, re-appeared.

Three new windtunnels to cost two millions each were announced by the California Institute of Technology, the Curtiss-Wright plant at Buffalo and the Ballistics Research Laboratory of the Army at Aberdeen, Md. The first two tunnels are to test all-metal models at air speeds up to 750 miles an hour, the speed of sound; the Army's tunnel will be used to study bombs, shells and rockets to increase accuracy of aim.

A treatment for stomach ulcers that relieved pain in one or two days and caused them to disappear in two or three weeks came from the New York University College of Medicine. The treatment involved fre-

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quent feedings with "amigen," a protein hydrolysate (predigested protein) now widely used in cases of severe malnutrition, extensive burns and surgical convalescence. "Amigen" is made by subjecting milk and hog pancreas to the digestive action of enzymes. In another treatment gastric juice was fed to patients with good results.

Para-aminobenzoic acid, one of the "B" vitamins, can be used to treat Rocky Mountain spotted fever, according to Drs. Harry M. Rose, Richard B. Duane and Edward E. Fischel (Columbia's College of Physicians and Surgeons).

Drs. Joseph Zichis and Howard J. Shaughnessy (Illinois State Health Department) discovered an apparently new virus that causes pneumonia. The virus resembles that which causes parrot fever (psittacosis) and is christened the "Illinois virus."

Drs. W. H. Price, C. F. Cori and S. P. Colowick (Washington University) threw much light on the way the body utilizes sugar and hence on diabetes. The three injected anterior pituitary extract into rats and thus gave them diabetes. When phosphates of the proper kind were then given with anterior pituitary extract the action of hexokinase was delayed. (Hexokinase is an ezyme or living catalyst without which sugar cannot be metabolized or burned up by the body.) Insulin releases hexokinase from the inhibition of the anterior pituitary.

Dr. William G. Lennox (Harvard) found that petit mal epilepsy can be treated better with a new drug called "triodone" than with any other. Frequent daily seizures were stopped in many cases.

Drs. Tom Spies, Carl F. Vilter in association with Mary B. Koch and Margaret H. Caldwell made the important discovery that synthetic folic acid, one of the "B" (vitamins), is dramatically successful in treating anemia and sprue. Liver extracts will not be displaced, but the physician now has another effective means of dealing with anemia.

Drs. W. D. Bartels and Ade T. Milhorat (Cornell) reported that tocopherol (vitamin "E") and inositol (one of the "Bs") may be a remedy for muscular dystrophy (muscle weakness). Neither vitamin does much good by itself, but large doses seem to be effective.

Streptomycin promises to be as important a discovery as penicillin. This new antibiotic has been effective in early Army cases of tuberculosis (before hardening by calcium has set in), in intestinal and urinary infections and in typhoid. Bacitracin, another new antibiotic, isolated from certain rod-shaped bacteria in wound infections, proved to be effective against pus-forming and blood-poisoning streptococci, staphylococci and gonococci.

From London came news of hypholin made from the same mold that yields penicillin. This hypholin contains in addition to penicillin the living hyphae (filaments) of the mold; it is an out-growth of work done with vivicillin, which was prematurely announced last year. William G. Meyers and Hazel Jean Hanson reported that new strains of penicillin notatum can be induced with bombardment with neutrons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commander Julius M. Amberson announced that "no one need die of cholera." He used blood plasma, sulfathiazine and salt solution in hundreds of cases in India with success.

New anti-malarials appeared. One, paludrine, synthetized in England from coal tar, is said to be more effective than atabrine, which, like quinine, merely prevents parasites already in the blood from doing their work.

The British reported that their B.A.L. (British anti-lewsite) is a good skin decontaminant and hence a protection against war gases. B.A.L. is now used in cases of arsenic poisoning.

A new chemical weapon, gamma (p-arsenosophenyl) butyric acid was found to be good in the treatment of African sleeping sickness in the early stages.

Hearts were successfully transplanted in warm-blooded animals in Russia, for the first time in medical history.

Dr. Charles D. Robeson and James G. Baxter reported the discovery of a new vitamin "A" in fish oils. The new vitamin has substantially the same potency as its ordinary counterpart.

Half a dozen plasma products came out of the laboratory of Prof. Edwin J. Cohn (Harvard) and were promptly introduced in 1945 by the armed forces. One is fibrin foam which clots blood and stops bleeding; another (gamma globulin) is given for measles and jaundice; a third (isohemaglutinin) makes blood-typing easier and more scientific; a fourth comes in film form and has been successfully used in difficult operations on the brain because it is absorbed after it has served its purpose; a fifth is thrombin which clots blood.

Andre Grönwall and Björn Ingalman (University of Uppsala) announced that "dextran" is as good as plasma in cases of shock. Dextran is a white jellylike substance which is produced by the microbe Leuconostoc mesenteroides and which has been a nuisance in sugar factories because it clogs up pipes.

• A draft board of New York was recently reprimanded by Selective Service headquarters in Washington for failing to list the middle name of Lieuieusszzieuss W. Hurrizzissitizzi.

Taking a deep breath, the local board complied. It sent in the middle name, which was Willikiminnzzissleizzii.

• General Montgomery and General Sir Alan Brooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, were having an audience with the King—so the story goes.

The business finished, Montgomery swept away dramatically.

Brooke said: "I guess I won't be seeing much more of you, Your Majesty. You know Montgomery is trying to get my job."

"Oh," said the King. "That's a relief. I thought he was trying to get mine."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brazil votes for a Vargas man

Dutra Wins

By Virginia Prewett

From her column in the Chicago Sun

BRAZILIANS are trying to figure out how the December 2 super-democratically honest and orderly elections could result in the endorsement of men who have denied Brazil a democratic government for half a generation.

In the first presidential vote in 15 years, conservative General Eurico Gaspar Dutra, supported by the ousted dictator-president, Getulio Vargas, rolled up what appears to be an insurmountable majority over Major General Eduardo Gomes, the democratic hope, and two lesser candidates.

To understand what happened it is necessary, first of all, to consider Brazil's country and city vote separately.

In the country districts the Jose Linhares government, installed by a bloodless army coup on October 29, did not have time to root out the well-entrenched Vargas machine which originally launched Dutra and swung in behind him at Vargas' command on the eve of the election.

In the country, it is conceded even by Gomes' followers, the votes for Dutra were really votes for Vargas.

Vargas' hold on the Brazilian people is based primarily on 15 years of intensive propaganda, topped off by a complete official shutdown on all criticism of him from November, 1937.

Late in 1939, the active press department started to create a cult of near-worship of Vargas as "the father of his people."

The state-controlled radio in remote sections dinned this into the people incessantly, with the result that rural Brazilians, who make up approximately half of the electorate, have scarcely heard of any other national figure.

The strongest point of Vargas' program with the poor everywhere was his custom every now and then of ordering wage increases.

Vargas' conspicuous failure to control prices adequately, meanwhile, launched Brazil on the road to inflation, which annulled the wage increases, but Brazilians in general did not even realize this.

Gomes' failure to win the cities where it was expected he would have a walkaway was due to a combination of factors, including his own campaign mistakes.

Until the October coup, his backers never really expected elections to be allowed and only started in earnest a little over a month before the date for voting.

In the final phase of the campaign a series of political moves cut much ground out from under Gomes' feet. The communists launched a civilian

© 1945, by the Chicago Sun, Chicago, Illinois

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nominee, Yeddo Fiuza, which split the democratic vote.

Meanwhile, an intense whispering campaign against Gomes was started. First of all, it was said he was anti-Negro and intended to "send them into the interior." Second, the attitude that the illiterate masses were not able to vote was distorted into a charge that Gomes said the working man did not count.

These charges at the last minute swung the vote which had been revolted by the expose of Fiuza into the Dutra column.

Brazilians on the whole are proud of their good showing in bringing off a reputable election.

There still exists a possibility that Vargas' forces may wangle some kind of legalized coup to return him to power through congressional action.

Or it could take the form of an early Dutra resignation and the holding of new elections with Vargas as a candidate.

In such a case, Vargas' opponents say they would abandon their present attitude of acquiescence.

Soviet policy is successful

Iron Curtain on Iran

By Jay G. Hayden

From his column in The Detroit News

STATESMEN and journalists of other countries may rail against Russia's black curtain of censorship, but none can deny that from the standpoint of the new Moscow imperialism, communist style, it works.

The latest illustration is the Soviet's amazingly swift and successful demarche in Iran.

One of the things that all newspaper correspondents visiting Iran during the war marveled at was the line between American and Russian zones of occupation, which no American soldier or civilian was permitted to cross even to deliver lend-lease goods.

Iran was a main avenue of American supply to Russia. War equipment, food, gasoline and other vital commodities, together with brand new motor trucks to carry them, were landed at Iranian ports. American Army drivers conducted these goods several hundred miles to points just short of the line of Russian occupation. There Russian drivers took over and we saw no more of either goods or trucks after they passed beyond eyesight in the direction of Russia.

The Iranian territory which the Russians thus shut off from American or other foreign observation for four years is the province of Azerbaijan, which just now has undergone an alleged popular revolution, detaching it from control of the Iranian shah.

© 1945, by The Detroit News, Detroit, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Information as to what is transpiring behind the Azerbaijan black curtain still is pure hearsay so far as the American and other foreign governments are concerned.

The shah's government admits that it has been run out of Azerbaijan and it attributes this loss to the refusal of the Russians to permit re-inforcement of small Iranian garrisons, which long had been virtual prisoners of the strong Soviet Army of occupation.

Iranian officials say the head of the new Azerbaijan government is Jafar Pishivara, a Communist, who moved in from Baku, Russia, to run the revolutionary show.

Scraps of information coming by way of the Moscow radio meanwhile are that the Azerbaijan government is dominated by a communist-led democratic party; that gendarmerie and police were being purged in favor of "freedom-loving patriots" and that a new militia is being recruited; and a widespread agrarian reform and land redistribution program is under way.

As for organization of the new government, Moscow says it has been strictly an affair of the Azerbaijan people. A Mejliz (parliament) first was assembled. It provided a provisional presidium, it elected a permanent presidium, and this in turn disbanded the temporary body.

A Cabinet was formed which negotiated peaceful surrender of the beleaguered local garrison in the capital city of Tabriz.

The Moscow radio adds that Russia is bound by the Teheran declaration that the Big Three — Britain, Russia and the United States—are "at one with the government at Teheran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran." So how can Russia be suspected of in anywise promoting Iranian dismemberment?

Over this whole situation, as with all other Iranian political developments in recent years, there hangs an unmistakable odor of oil.

Britain was the first to grab Iranian oil concessions, as an aftermath to military operations during World War I. Russia long has displayed desire to get its finger into the same oil pool, and its process of attaining this end may not prove in the final analysis to have been different fundamentally from that which the British employed.

There is the collateral difference that the British had not committed themselves against infringing Iran's sovereignty before they grabbed for its oil and that the Russians appear to have taken advantage of the fact that both Britain and the United States had joined in pledging Iranian independence and were withdrawing their troops in consonance with this understanding.

• This mechanized age has influenced even affairs of the heart. One girl, who suddenly found herself engaged to five different servicemen, commented, "I guess Cupid must have shot me with a machine gun!"

• One returning veteran, when asked how he felt under fire, parodied: "My only regret was that I had but one life to give to my country. If I'd had two, I would have felt a lot safer."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The $64 question

How Are Your Illusions?

By Philip Wylie

From his column "Off My Chest" in the New York Post

THE way to be happy, healthy and wise—in case you want to know—is to ask yourself at least daily the $64 question:

"How are my illusions?"

That question is, indeed, the honest man's prayer. It is a far more noble prayer than many others—prayers, for example, which are mere lists of things wanted, like letters to Santa Claus, and prayers which are SOS's cried out by people demanding help for something they ought to do on their own.

In the hierarchy of prayer, I venture to say, self-searching comes even before praying for other people—a procedure which I have observed to be more often officious and conceited than generous and discerning.

The idea that we have to have illusions is another one of those family idiocies which are taught in childhood and strongly supported by society throughout life. They teach you that there are brownies under the toadstools in your back yard as soon as you can talk. When you get to the first grade, they begin the process of inspiring you with the insane propaganda that all prominent Americans in history were noble, chaste and kindly.

By the time you are twenty-one, you are lucky if you still have a grip on a handful of facts and a dozen real principles. So you desperately need to spend a lot of time disillusioning yourself.

Yet people cling to this business of bedeviling themselves with unreliable data as if it were holy. Not long ago a very prominent lady author wrote a letter to me in protest of some statement of mine. She based her case on this statement: "Nobody can stand the truth, nobody can bear to look for it, always; it is too horrible and it would drive everybody crazy; you have got to have illusions about things."

Now, this is a hell of an attitude for 1946. It belongs in the Pollyanna decades. The lady who wrote the letter was, herself, a victim of it—a chronic nervous wreck.

To have an illusion is to ask for trouble. The man who finds his jugular vein sliced by a fraction of his windshield is the man who permitted himself the illusion that his brakes were okay, not because he examined them, but because he wished them to be okay since he didn't want to go to the trouble of inspection and possible repair.

The trick, when you're worried, or frightened (which is the same thing), or dissatisfied, or frustrated, is to discover what your own illusions about the situation may be. You make your bed and lie in it; if you also lie about it—who's fooled?

© 1945, by the New York Post, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

By Jasper R. Lewis

PLANNING FOR WORLD ORDER

World Order. Its Intellectual and Cultural Foundations. Edited by F. Ernest Johnson.

Civilization and Group Relationships. Edited by R. M. MacIver. (New York: Institute for Religious Studies. Distributed by Harper & Bros. Each, $2.00.)

Since a world community of any kind will hardly come about of itself, anything pertinent to the subject should be of value if it is constructive. In *World Order,* Its Intellectual and Cultural Foundations, eminent leaders in religious and intellectual fields contribute lectures delivered in 1943-44, dealing at least in some measure with the general topic. Some are by clergymen, some by college professors. It follows that each, in presenting his own view, lays emphasis on the part his professional calling is qualified to perform. The clergyman adheres to the equality of man and brotherhood under God. The philosopher selects those principles of Kant or Hegel which to him seem to point to the desired end. Sometimes he picks apart the statements of his compeers, as Professor Brightman of Boston University does to Professor MacIver who, incidentally, edits the second book we are discussing. And that, in Cabell's words, is the Rivet in Grandfather's Neck. For if the leaders in thought can only see their own objectives, what can the masses see?

Margaret Mead, who is an anthropologist, seems to bear more directly on the problem by discussing the differences between humans, not from a theoretical plane, but from material and understandable values. It is noteworthy that in comparing Englishmen and Americans she writes: "What are the implications of the American's belief in man's absolute powers to alter and change the environment unchecked by anything?" The arrival of the atomic age bears out her statement, although she regrets her rashness later by invoking the aid of religion to secure a new world order.

The sociologist sees a new culture which, stripped of technical terms, is simply a return to a high idealism of service to humanity. Professor Sorokin contributes a scholarly discourse on this, chiefly a lessening of the materialistic concept of life, and a growth of the spiritual. The odds are against him, however, for if anything the world is headed the other way.

For the churches, John Lafarge contributes a chapter on the attitude of Catholicism toward an organization for world order which is simple and clear. It is that impartiality is a basic tenet; that national society and spiritual primacy of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual are inseparable. The Church itself seeks to cooperate with all other spiritual agencies looking to the same goal, but does not purpose to be the organizer. Dr. John C. Bennett, giving the Protestant view, apparently is not ready to condemn the Axis powers for their sins, but insists on the United Nations, or possibly our entire civilization, sharing the burden because of the conditions which permitted the war to arise. He is evidently not partial to American free enterprise; he believes that such a system will be inacceptable in Europe, and that American churches are divided on the question of whether to follow New Deal or "planned economy" or revert to the previous free-booting days. Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan, for the Jewish faith, while admitting there is little the Jews can do in behalf of world order except what the Gentiles permit them to do, is strongly in favor of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

One requirement to promote common understanding and good will is self-evident: the need for world-wide re-education. Possibly one of the best essays is that of Norman Cousins, who sees the reluctance of sovereign nations to form an effective world body, but points out that this does not obviate the need for one. The democratic cycle begins with education, enlightenment and evolution. Isolationism must perforce be forgotten; democracy must lead in the effort, which naturally pleases us, but he does not state his position regarding the Soviet system's part, which is important.

Last but not least, the question of whether the churches — all of them—are realistic about color and race is debated by F. Ernest Johnson, and Dr. Johnson is realistic about it. He is aware that the millions who have been in service will question, not the spiritual ideals, but the institutional structures and program. The importance of this in any consideration of world order is not small.

Professor MacIver, in the second volume, presses for a change of attitude toward minorities or other groups. As an example, he shows how statistics seem to show a higher criminal ratio in Negro population as against whites; analysis shows that, based on literacy, the rate is about the same. It is fact finding that is important; prejudice is common to all groups, while understanding leads to the removal of prejudice.

Another direct approach to the topic is delivered by Karl N. Llewellyn of Columbia University, who affirms the differences between In-Groups and Out-Groups, the simple distinction of whether a person "belongs" to one's own crowd, church or club. This is an elemental obstacle to general fellowship; it is the natural result of group life and training. Major operations to excise this are infrequent, but if the average person would make an individual effort in his own conduct, the sum of all such effort must have its effect. The prejudices are not directed toward only a few groups; practically every group has them against all others.

Another clear concept is offered by Joseph S. Roucek, who doesn't think the United States is fighting the war as a people. (This was writ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten in 1943.) Aside from economic divisions, he sees the great gaps between cultural and racial groups. He mentions the prejudices against the Negro, the Jew, the Mexican, the Oriental, etc., and calls attention to the fact that the second generation group of immigrants totals 26,000,000, a sizeable part of our people. These suffer socially, economically and educationally; the author boldly suggests that our textbooks be rewritten to include the strivings and sacrifices of those who worked or fought as did the descendants of Anglo-Saxons. Since 1820, 38,000,000 immigrants have landed here; their impact, and that of their descendents, with that of earlier settlers, has formed a new combined culture. In other words, the schoolroom is responsible for some of the prejudice.

Then comes Edmund de S. Brunner of Columbia, who describes the inequalities of opportunity for education in different areas of the country and asks that this unevenness be banished, which is good. It is noteworthy, however, that he uses this phrase in describing one disadvantaged group: "Their forebears were not among the finest stock that ever migrated to these shores in colonial days." The implications of that remark, from a university professor, in connection with group relationships, are not favorable to a study of tolerance.

There are chapters that recognize that it is money power that makes most distinctions; the struggle of the masses for security is natural, but it need not mean the end of private enterprise. Diversity in race and religion is a cause of disunity; the good Bishop H. St. George Tucker, D.D., a Southerner himself, feels that as long as a group confines its efforts to improving its welfare within its own group, it will not have opposition. Again, each religious minority must not become fanatic and try to impose its point of view on all others. In a discussion of world tolerance, it is not impertinent to ask if the same restriction should not be laid on majorities?

In the final chapter, Professor MacIver admits that progress cannot be made by pressing the claims of any one group (which most of these writers seem to have done). He points out that tolerance is really an insult; the issue is "reception of the differences into the unity of the whole society." His remedy is social re-education; it is sound, and on the basis of these lectures it is not cynical to add that this re-education might begin at the top.

BRIEFER COMMENT

A different conception of the problem of living with world neighbors is contained in *Nationalities and National Minorities,* by Oscar I. Janowsky, (Macmillan, $2.75). The population of east-central Europe is the center of the study, which is notable for rejection of the principle of tolerance in favor of what is called "national federalism." Stated simply, it means that any group of people with the same ideals or religion or culture, can retain its identity, while being a component

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of a greater federation. This might be the only solution in the European area, and the substitution of self-rule and equality for tolerance is an idea with merit.

HISTORY

While its author disclaims any official status for the book, *Wartime Mission in Spain, 1942-1945,* by Carlton J. H. Hayes, (Macmillan, $3.00), is more than just a personal account of his diplomatic mission there as American Ambassador. As an historian he noted details of negotiation, diplomacy and policy which throw much light on the Spanish problem during the war years. Hayes tells, without criticism, of differences of opinion between his colleagues and the British; the views of the State Department, sometimes at variance with his own; and other matters little realized by the average citizen. It is an educational, frankly written volume.

You can read it as history, or you can pretend it is fiction; either way you will find *The Perilous Fight,* by Neil H. Swanson (Farrar & Rinehart, $3.50), good reading and a fine, absorbing story. It is a chapter of the War of 1812, the burning of Washington, and the British march on Baltimore. It is the Baltimoreans, led by Sam Smith, merchant and soldier, who are the heroes. The book is well documented, but the notes are never in the way, and Swanson tells his story with human and humorous quirks, pricking the balloons of legends which have grown up, and giving his characters life and breath.

Japan and the Son of Heaven, by Willard Price, (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $2.75), is a short cut to understanding some of the basic characteristics of the people, and their worship of the Emperor as political leader and God. Price, who should know after his residence in Japan, doesn't think much of the imperial line, its behavior or its ability. To those who think that Shinto should be permitted to continue as a religion (on the grounds of religious liberty) he answers that from that angle Shinto is not what it seems to be. It is a device to secure the totalitarian rule of the emperor and his clique.

BIOGRAPHY

Soldiers of Democracy, by Kenneth S. Davis, (Doubleday, $3.50), is "a full-length biography of Dwight Eisenhower." Davis has some first-rate chapters on the family and the early days of his subject; but there is much about lesser figures which might well have been omitted. In the subsequent period, the biographer wanders far afield in opinions on the Wilson-Lodge battle, appraisals of English and French military leaders and policies, etc. Sometimes Davis fights the war over again. Surely, if Davis knew that "the commander was reported to be 'death' on long-winded reports," he might have boiled down his book to about half its 600 pages. Eisenhower is well enough beloved by America not to need a portrayal as an almost perfect man; he must have some faults and idiosyncracies.

A Fellow of Infinite Jest, a Biography of Laurence Sterne, by Thomas Yoseloff (Prentice-Hall, $3.00), is sympathetic to Yorick and the foibles of his times, but is some-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how sketchy and superficial. There is not much detail of his life; there is an outline of the changes in his fortunes, in his sentimental adventures and in his health. It is more a resumé of a career than a work of biographical proportions.

LITERATURE

For those of literary bent who are desirous of further acquaintance with the many critiques and appraisals of Henry James, *The Question of Henry James,* edited by F. W. Dupee, (Holt, $3.75), offers a collection of 25 essays, from the ridicule of Max Beerbohm to the worship of Conrad and others.

GENERAL

As a travelogue you will find that *Brazil,* Bulwark of Inter-American Relations, by Henry Albert Phillips, (Hastings House, $2.50), contains chapters of adventure and information on the economic and social structure of the country. The author's views politically, on Vargas particularly, are at variance with other opinions, but there is excitement and interest in the expeditions into the heart of the country.

Atom Smashers, by Raymond F. Yates, (Didier, $2.00), is intended to be an informal exposition of the subject for laymen. It is inexact to say Yates makes the story so simple that anyone can understand it, but he helps the average reader picture the process. The marvels of the electronic age are described, culminating in the atomic bomb, and it makes an interesting book even if it is sometimes beyond the reader's grasp.

The argument for socialism is continued in *Socialism Looks Forward,* by John Strachey, (Philosophical Library, $2.00). Soviet Russia is considered as a socialist state, and Strachey, while stressing that elimination of exploitation is the aim, does not convince one that exploitation has been deleted from Russian life.

The outstanding impression gained from *A Ribbon and A Star,* by John Monks, Jr., (Holt, $2.75), is that the Third Marines at Bougainville were not only tough fighters but human and regular fellows who lived in a hell, fought like devils, and all with a communal spirit that defied everything. It is a book of individuals and their experiences; the illustrations by John Falter are artistically crude to match the settings.

In fiction, *Focus,* by Arthur Miller, (Reynal & Hitchcock, $2.50), is a powerful story of it-can't-happen-here, but does. It revolves around the sufferings and experiences of a Gentile who finds himself eventually mistaken for a Jew, in the midst of Christian Fronters and others of like ilk. He is a pathetic figure, even in his loves. It makes an absorbing novel, and also one with a courageous purpose in consideration of a sore spot in our life.

• It has been suggested that employment agencies are missing a bet by not calling themselves "Satan, Incorporated," because Satan finds work for idle hands.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

DECEMBER is the season for gifts, and the theatre treated itself to a few. The Yule-tide spirit was most in evidence in a series of packages consisting of Maurice Evans' G.I. version of *Hamlet,* in Elmer Rice's *Dream Girl,* the new musical *Billion Dollar Baby,* and the Gertrude Lawrence revival of Shaw's *Pygmalion.*

Maurice Evans, who once gave us the only unabbreviated *Hamlet* within memory, has gone completely in the opposite direction with the most abbreviated version, minus even the Gravediggers' scene. Brought back from a successful tour in the Pacific area, where Major Evans trimmed the great tragedy for speed and simplicity of staging, the production proved to be a driving and at the same time fascinating melodrama. It was something more, of course, thanks to Shakespeare's poetry, and this able actor-producer is not one to overlook opportunities for recitation. Each Hamlet monologue, whether short or long, became an aria, and I doubt whether anyone in the non-Latin nations has had a proper introduction to the classic theatre of Greece, Rome or France who has not witnessed his performance. That great poet of the French theatre, Jean Racine, has remained a mystery to those of us who are not completely bilingual. It has been difficult for us to conceive that a play like *Phèdre* can be effective when it consists of long formal speeches. The new Evans production combines melodramatic action with French classic formalism.

To facilitate the speed of the action, the director, George Schaefer, no doubt under orders from his Major, has staged everything on a unit-set designed by Frederick Stover. The settings are various but have an easily sensed unity; they are colorful and impressive and yet functional. Excellent incidental music by Roger Adams heightens the atmosphere and tides us over the brief breaks in visual continuity. The production comes over without a hitch, and the interest never flags. To bring the action closer to us, as well as to disencumber the actors of their armor, the production costumed them in nineteenth century European habiliments. Hardly anything in the G.I. version would be incongruous at some continental court in the pre-Victorian period—hardly anything, that is, if we except the Ghost, who belongs to the Elizabethan tradition. The results are somewhat anomalous. Yet there is a certain degree of logic in this measure. One way of interpreting Hamlet is to view him as a prototype of the heroes of early nineteenth century romanticism. By-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ronism is not far removed from Hamletism; both Byron and Hamlet are synonymous with disillusion, morbid grief and a sense of damnation or fatality.

Supporting Evans are Thomas Gomez as Claudius, Thomas Chalmers as Polonius, Walter Coy as Horatio, Frances Reid as Ophelia, and Lili Darvas as the Queen. They deliver, for the most part, carefully thought out performances, and a good deal may be written about the various interpretations, which diverge from the traditional in many instances. (One divergence, Ophelia's using a book on flowers rather than flowers in the mad-scene, is quite interesting; and Miss Reid is a very good Ophelia.) But they form a dim galaxy beside Evans, and this is to no one's advantage. In all his endeavors to unify the effect of the production, Mr. Evans forgot to harmonize the supporting actors with himself; the former play in a style of realistic restraint while he coruscates romantically. Another anomaly will be found in the costuming, which suggests a Byronic treatment while Mr. Evans' Hamlet is generally devoid of the pale cast of thought. There were moments when this reviewer thought of Graustark and Ruritania, instead of Elsinore. That, in fact, is the chief limitation of the actor's performance, as well as of the interpretation he foists upon the play by production and editing which dispensed with Shakespeare's chiaroscuro. The very omission of the Gravedigger's scene indicates a rather surface view of the tragedy, in which the macabre element was as integral as the heroic. There is conspicuously less dimension and depth in this *Hamlet,* and in previous presentations by Evans, than in the great text.

Nevertheless, the production remains the peak of the season, and its eminence is unlikely to be challenged by anything that will reach the boards in 1946. There is the play, God be praised, and there is Evans, who projects the action and reads the lines better than he ever did. He is the best Hamlet of our generation, except for John Gielgud, whose psychoanalytic approach to the role had, however, its own limitations when we saw him in New York.

A smaller measure of greatness pertains to *Pygmalion,* although G.B.S. might dispute the point. It is a mistake to deny emotion to the author of *Candida, Androcles and the Lion* and *St. Joan.* But Shaw wrote *Pygmalion* out of his head, not his heart. Nevertheless, intellectual passion is a nearly adequate equivalent, and there is plenty of it in the first offering of the recently founded Theatre Incorporated. This auspicious beginning must be credited largely to Gertrude Lawrence, whose Eliza Doolittle is a thoroughly expert performance. When Eliza is a cockney flower-girl, Miss Lawrence commits such assault and battery on the King's English that only hanging would suit the crime. When Eliza has been sufficiently exposed to young Professor Higgins' elocution lessons, Miss Lawrence is murderously funny; externally she is all lady and her pronunciation would do credit to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duchess, but she "slays" us with her refined use of unmentionable language without blinking an eye as she sails through a Victorian salon in a fetching costume. Then Miss Lawrence executes a tailspin in the third act and plays a mature Eliza better even than Lynn Fontanne (if memory doesn't deceive); plays her with the right proportions of feeling and intelligence, pathos and rebelliousness. It is not the most sparkling of performances, and she overdoes the cockney, but it almost comes up to Shaw's writing. The supporting cast rarely falls much below adequacy. Melville Cooper's Doolittle disappoints only because the role is so much better than it appears in the present revival. Although Raymond Massey seems too strenuous or brash in the role of Professor Higgins, he looks sufficiently bright and limber to convey the essence of this Shavian character, who is all spirit and intelligence. Massey does better in Act Three and does justice to Shaw's conception of a modern, completely confident male who does not need the salve of feminine subservience for his ego. If he is not entirely "human," this is because he interprets a Shavian creation in too Shavian a manner—that is, as a new kind of roughneck who rides roughshod over ordinary humaneness.

The result is a generally satisfying realization of a brilliant comedy, which is one of the classics of dramatic modernism, even if it is a notch or two below Shaw's best. By comparison with it, even our most resolutely modern intellectual comedies seem rather sentimental and namby-pamby. In what current comedy can we find so brilliant a series of comic ideas as Doolittle's comments on middle-class life or the notion that pronunciation and clothing make the difference between a flower girl and a duchess, including the addition that "the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves but how she's treated?" Where will one find a better commentary on manners than Higgins' defense: "The great secret, Eliza, is not having bad manners or good manners or any other particular sort of manners, but having the same manners for all human souls; in short, behaving as if you were in Heaven, where there are no third-class carriages, and one soul is as good as another."

Where will we find a more applicable thought than his rejoinder to Eliza, who has complained that his lessons have unfitted her for her station: "Would the world ever have been made if its maker had been afraid of making trouble? Making life means making trouble. There's only one way of escaping trouble; and that's killing things. Cowards, you notice, are always shrieking to have troublesome people killed." And what other dramatist would have dared to conclude this play without having Pygmalion marry his Galatea. Higgins' reply to her complaint that he doesn't care for her is merely, "I care for life, for humanity; and you are a part of it that has come my way and been built into my house. What more can you or anybody ask?" Cold porridge, perhaps, for a movie audience and for ordinary living, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how exhilarating after the lukewarm pablum of most entertainment!

The contrast between *Pygmalion* and Elmer Rice's *Dream Girl,* coming within a week of each other, can only lessen enthusiasm for the latter. *Dream Girl* is sentiment masquerading as modernism, which is substantiated only by a few unconventional *obiter dicta* and by some very good sparring between a romantic girl and a sharp-tongued newspaper man, who unite in holy matrimony in the end. It is the kind of comedy in which no one is really hurt, and in which balm is poured over the wounds administered to sentiment. Nor does the play's *Lady in the Dark* technique serve as more than a theatrically attractive device which leads to humdrum drama at some points, if it also inspires some excellent scenes. The burden of Rice's comedy is that dreaming is a cheat and a snare. Since a considerable portion of American girlhood is still wedded to Hollywood dreamfulness, the point is well directed. But it is not finely ground; it can barely penetrate the epidermis.

Nevertheless, it is unfair to apply the oversized Shavian yardstick to *Dream Girl.* By more moderate, ordinary standards, Mr. Rice's latest play is generally successful and engaging. It is ingenious comedy, though some of the ingenuity, as in the courtroom scene, harks back to his *Adding Machine* of 1923 vintage. Since, moreover, the play must not be judged independently of its production, it is to be noted that the author has fabricated an ideal vehicle for Betty Field, and that he has staged it even more expertly than he has written it. The multi-scened production is a model of contrast, smoothness and orchestration of effects. The cast is extremely well chosen, and is wisely directed. Wendell Corey, in the role of a rambunctious journalist, proves himself one of our most valuable supporting players. And Betty Field is supreme as she dreams her way with equal facility through a wide assortment of roles as mother, mistress, prostitute, murderess and Shakespeare's Portia. Miss Field, who by a happy conjunction of circumstances is also the heroine of that fine film *The Southerner,* has proved herself the most accomplished young actress to reach the American stage in over a decade. The theatre, which has been singularly laggard in bringing out stellar acting material, is fortunate in having her. She combines an utterly winning personality with forceful and flexible delivery; she has decisive movements and gestures, but without mechanical angularity, and both her eyes and mouth serve her as expressive instruments. She is never cloying in sentimental passages, never maudlin in tragic ones. Her transitions of personality are effortless and convincing. Her athletic feminity—one might describe it as feminity without coyness, or as sensitivity with force—is uncommonly refreshing.

If *Dream Girl* is subject to the soft impeachment that it is mild, the new musical *Billion Dollar Baby* is subject to the criticism that it is brash. If there is too much milk in the consistency of the former, there is too much acid in the latter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More specifically, it may be said that *Billion Dollar Baby* is not wholly satisfying because it falls between humor and wit. Since it hasn't heart or warmth enough to be humor, it should have wit. It is cold enough to be wit, but it lacks wit's brilliance and edge.

Yet there is much to be grateful for in this musical travesty on the alcoholic, materialistic 'twenties tracing the primrose path of a gold-digger who just misses becoming Uncle Sam's Miss America and becomes instead the darling of less reputable characters. The book hammers away at the theme with many a dent in the *corpus delicti* of the vanished age. The hammering becomes monotonous because the feminine Pal Joey runs true to form with too much regularity and without having a particularly interesting character structure. But the dents are theatrically interesting thanks to very able staging, by George Abbott, clever if unmelodic music by Morton Gould, and above all remarkably adept choreography by Jerome Robbins, who performed the same yeoman service for last season's *On the Town*. The musical skims the cream of its plot by means of three ballets, a Charleston travesty, a gangster's funeral, and the heroine's perhaps too literal fantasy of the life she would lead with a gangster if she followed the dictates of her heart. Augmented by such apt travesties as those on speakeasy culture, Texas Guinan night-club entertainment, and Babbitism (the Babbitts of the stock-market even bet on the moon!), *Billion Dollar Baby* is an astringent for jaded appetites. Mitzi Green wins first honors as the hearty Texas Guinan of the play. Joan McCracken, playing the gold-digger, is not too far behind; her personal charm goes far toward mitigating the vixenish role.

On the rest of the December productions this report can economize: In *The Mermaids Singing,* John Van Druten dramatizes the middle-aged problem of infatuation with youth and reluctant renunciation, the hero in this case being a successful playwright. The writing has sparkle. The story is old and not particularly illuminating. The play comes as an anticlimax after the author's *Voice of the Turtle* and his *I Remember Mama* dramatization. *Strange Fruit* proved unwieldy and bumbling despite thematic importance and some striking scenes, probably because of the difficulties of dramatizing the novel and the inexperience of the novelist-dramatist. It is doubtful whether the play will disseminate its theme as widely as the book, though the intention remains just as honorable. *The French Touch* proved to be an acute disappointment considering the promising theme of a French actor-playwright's battle with a Nazi commandant. The authors were only partially responsible for the failure. Much of the blame devolves upon unfortunate casting. *The French Touch,* however, was virtually the only fly in December's ointment.

• "Nervousness is the penalty you pay for being a race horse instead of a cow."

—*Richard C. Borden*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The International Scene

Big Three relations stalemated after the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers early in October, 1945. Hopes for world peace and security sank after the ill-fated peace conference, the first among the Big Powers. But early in December came the announcement that the Big Three would try again. United States' Secretary of State James F. Byrnes and British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin journeyed to Moscow, where, on December 15, they began a 12-day conference with Soviet Foreign Commissar Vyacheslav Molotov. During these 12 days the world waited hopefully for news of definite progress but only trivia was released. Secretary of State Byrnes had learned to say "I agree" and "No" in Russian. A wayward owl was adopted by the American delegation. Byrnes and Bevin visited Premier Joseph Stalin. Then on December 24 came the Christmas present, a 4,500 word communiqué.

MOSCOW ACCORD

The major achievements contained in the agreement were: (1) a proposed method for international control of atomic energy; (2) a formula for drafting peace treaties with the defeated European countries (the problem that had split the London Meeting) and (3) new measures for dealing with the control of Japan, the future of Korea and the unification of China. Specifically, Byrnes seems to have said "I agree" more than "No." Russia's special position in eastern Europe was recognized and her participation in the control of the Far East was assured. At Russian insistence the problems of the Middle East, (which Great Britain particularly wanted to solve), were postponed for future discussion. Result—the re-establishment of Big Three unity.

On the atomic bomb, Russia virtually endorsed the policy that had been outlined by the United States, Great Britain and Canada on November 15. A U.N.O. Commission was "to consider problems arising from the discovery of atomic energy," promote the exchange of scientific knowledge, propose security controls, propose a method for the liquidation of atomic-weapon stockpiles and safeguard the United Nations from violations or evasions of agreements. For the time being the "ABC" powers will retain the secret. The United States and Great Britain conceded to Russia, however, the subordination of the atomic commission to the Security Council rather than to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

The deadlock over the European peace treaties was broken by three agreements. The foreign ministers decided that "only members of the Council [of Foreign Ministers] who are . . . signatory of the surrender

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terms will participate in treaty-making." Secondly, due to American insistence, the small nations will have a voice. After the treaties are drafted, a peace conference of the Big Five and 16 other nations which actively engaged in the war will meet not later than May 1, 1946. The original signatory states will then consider the proposals recommended by the peace conference in drawing up the final drafts. Thirdly, the Soviet Union agreed to sanction the "broadening" of the Rumanian and Bulgarian governments in return for British and American recognition of these states.

Russia had been crying for some time for a voice in the control of Japan. She refused to participate in the Far Eastern *Advisory* Commission set up in Washington, holding out for more than advice. Now the Big Three have re-organized the Far Eastern Commission. Eleven nations, including Soviet Russia, will determine policy. Their decisions will be carried out by a Big Four Control Council sitting in Tokyo, of which the Supreme Allied Commander (General MacArthur) will be the permanent chairman.

In Korea the United States and Russia will form a joint commission for control. Eventually a Big Four trusteeship will be set up for Korea, to last not more than five years, in preparation for Korean self-government.

All three foreign ministers agreed to the need for a "unified and democratic China under the National government" and for "a cessation of civil strife." In addition Russia and the United States have agreed to withdraw their troops "at the earliest possible moment."

Whatever the reaction, and the reaction was varied and somewhat dubious, the way was cleared for the meeting of the U.N.O. General Assembly in January. The U.N.O. was assured of strong backing by the dominant Big Three.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The first General Assembly of the United Nations Organization opened in London on January 10 in a new effort to "maintain peace and international security." Delegates from 51 countries assembled in a church hall adjacent to Westminster Hall to establish the international machinery for peace-keeping. From the United States came Secretary James F. Byrnes, head of the American delegation, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., permanent American member of the Security Council, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senators Tom Connally of Texas and Vandenberg of Michigan.

Among other issues, the General Assembly is to decide the exact location of the United Nations permanent headquarters in the United States. At this writing a special U.N.O. subcommittee is visiting the suggested locations in the designated area of eastern United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PEACE IN CHINA?

On New Year's Eve, the Chinese National government proposed that representatives consult with General Marshall, special United States' Ambassador who had recently arrived in China. The talks are to discuss procedures for the cessation of hostilities between the Kuomintang and Communist armies. In accordance with this proposal Communist General Chou En-lai and Nationalist General Chang Chun met General Marshall in Chungking on January 7. With the latter acting as consultant and mediator, agreement on all major civil strife problems was announced by the representatives and the prospects of peace picked up. In his statement on policy in China, President Truman implicitly asked for a concentrated effort to attain a unified and broadened Chinese government as a condition of continued American support. The necessity for a broadened Chinese government was also expressed in the Moscow communiqué (see above).

REPUDIATION

Unparalleled was Emperor Hirohito's repudiation of divinity. Shinto history reveals that the Japanese emperors are in direct line of descent from the Sun Goddess, Amaterasu, and that Hirohito is the 124th emperor in this line. Suddenly on January 1 this divinity was overturned by the most binding of all Japanese laws, an imperial rescript. The Japanese people were ordered to forget the "false conception that the Emperor is divine and that the Japanese people are superior to other races and are fated to rule the world." Instead they were promised the "elimination of misguided practices of the past," free assembly and a government based upon public opinion.

BRITISH WAR RELIEF

After 12 weeks of negotiation, Secretary of State Byrnes and Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson for the United States and the Earl of Halifax, British Ambassador, signed a financial agreement on December 6. The official announcement was issued simultaneously in a statement read to Parliament by Prime Minister Attlee and in a release by President Truman over here. The agreement includes the first final termination of a lend-lease account with any of the lend-lease countries. This confirmed the expectations that the bulk of lend-lease would be written off to victory, which, in the case of Great Britain, amounts to about $25,000,000,000. Secondly, a line of credit, not a lump-sum loan, of $3,750,000,000 is available to be drawn upon by Great Britain until December 31, 1951. The United States will also lend the British an additional sum, between $50,000,0000 and $700,000,000, to be used in final settlement of lend-lease balances and to pay for surplus United States war properties now in the United Kingdom. In another provision, the British agree to a set of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberal trade principles, similar, in the field of world trade, to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals in the field of international politics.

Copies of this last provision, the commercial policy charter, were sent by Secretary Byrnes to all countries except Spain and Argentina. Possibly the charter will be used as a basis for discussion in the international trade conference to be held during the summer of 1946.

FOR 1,500,000 TONS OF RICE

Siam's political independence, but more particularly her wealth of tin and rubber, fell under Japanese dominance soon after Pearl Harbor. On January 25, 1942, the Thai government, against the opposition of many of its people, declared war against Great Britain. On January 1, 1946, almost four years later, the state of war was brought to an end by the conclusion and signing of a British-Siamese treaty of peace. In Singapore's historic Government House, representatives of the United Kingdom, the government of India and the Kingdom of Siam signed the document. Premier Seni Pramoj's government promised to give Great Britain 1,500,000 tons of rice. The treaty also restored Siam's pre-war boundaries, renewed British concessions and once again the country's natural resources came within the British orbit. One interesting feature of the treaty was that Great Britain undertook to sponsor Siam's candidacy for the United Nations Organization.

"AS WE WERE"

The conference in London between the British and Netherlanders ended on December 28 with an official expression of satisfaction. Holland's Premier Willem Schermerhorn had gone to discuss with Prime Minister Attlee and other Britishers the ways and means of empire-mending. But it was definitely a matter of mending and not releasing: home rule for Indonesia still seemed a long way off. The communiqué worded it this way: "The British government re-affirmed their obligation to their Dutch allies to establish without delay conditions of security in which it would be possible for the government of the Netherlands East Indies to continue negotiations with representative Indonesians." Both the Indonesians and the Netherlands government desire the return of "conditions of security" but, from all current appearances, that is the extent of their agreement.

THE FUTURE OF FRANCO

The end of Franco's nine year rule in Spain seemed to be approaching late in December as a French proposal for severing diplomatic relations with the present Spanish government was approved in London and Washington. According to the proposal, a tripartite conference will be held in Paris within the next month to arrange for the diplomatic break and to prepare for the recognition of a new government. Meanwhile in Mexico City, the Spanish Republican regime worked hard for recognition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and prepared to send its important members, particularly Dr. Jose Giral y Pereira, the Premier, to Paris. The Spanish "government-in-exile" also pressed its influence in London where Dr. Juan Negrin, the last Republican Premier of Spain, arrived to discuss the situation with British Prime Minister Attlee.

NEW CARDINALS

The world wide character of the Roman Catholic Church was increased on December 23 when Pope Pius XII named as cardinals 32 prelates from 19 countries. By this move the overwhelming majority of Italians in the College of Cardinals, in effect since the great schism in the fourteenth century, was reduced to 40 per cent of the total membership of 70. For the first time in history every continent is represented.

Recognition of the ever-growing importance of the "New World" was apparent in the new geographical distribution. Now represented by three cardinals, North and South America will have a total of 14, including four additional cardinals from the United States. For the first time China, Australia, Cuba and Chile will be represented. And the Pope did not overlook war-torn Europe. Three cardinals each were chosen from victorious France. defeated Germany, and totalitarian Spain and one each from red-dominated Poland and Hungary.

Following the announcement about the new cardinals, Pope Pius XII called for an end of totalitarianism in his Christmas Eve message and outlined the "fundamental moral prerequisites of a true and lasting peace." "The Church," said the Pope, "should endeavor to use to the best advantage her undivided and indivisible integrity. She must be now, more than ever, supra-national."

The new College of Cardinals will meet in the Vatican on February 18.

The Domestic Scene

"Nineteen forty-six is our year of decision. This year we lay the foundation of our economic structure which will have to serve for generations. This year we must decide whether or not we shall devote our strength to reaching the goal of full production and full employment. This year we shall have to make the decisions which will determine whether or not we shall devote our strength to reaching the goal of full production and full employment. This year we shall have to make the decisions which will determine whether or not we gain that great future at home and abroad which we fought so valiantly to achieve.

"I wish I could say to you that everything is in perfect order—that we are on the way to eternal prosperity."

"I cannot."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATION IN THROES OF LABOR PAINS

One of the major factors in President Truman's gloomy outlook in his fireside chat of January 3 was obviously the epidemic of major strikes which pressed upon the nation's vital economic nerve centers. The existing or potential walk-outs in the automotive, steel, electrical, telephone and meat packing industries may involve directly 1,500,000 workers; many times that number are affected indirectly.

In mid-January the General Motors dispute was a familiar blot on the economic landscape. Many and diverse were the suggested methods of reaching some compromise, but they all had the one common element of failure. The most promising effort was the three-man fact-finding board appointed by President Truman on December 12 to study the dispute and report its findings to the President. The board consisted of Lloyd Garrison, chairman and War Labor Board member, Judge Stacy, head of the ill-fated Labor-Management Conference, and Milton Eisenhower, Kansas State College president and brother of the general.

The fact-finding board, however, came to bat with two strikes against it. When it met in Washington on December 20 with representatives of General Motors and the United Automobile Workers, President Truman announced that "since wages are paid out of earnings, the question of earnings is relevant." Even though he stressed the fact that the company books should not be publicized if it should result in harm to the company's standing with its competitors, General Motors was quick to object. In a move to stem the obvious failure, the board decided that ability to pay would be taken as relevant to wage increases, but whether or not the board would demand investigation of the firm's books would "be determined by the future developments in the case."

There were, unfortunately, few future developments. The board, perhaps thinking wistfully that the holiday spirit of good will toward men might prevail, ordered a brief recess of the hearings to give G.M. and the U.A.W. another chance to settle their differences by collective bargaining. When the board re-convened on December 26 it was greeted with a stalemate. Two days later the G.M. attorney read to the panel a 2,500-word statement which concluded with: "The General Motors Corporation feels that it has no choice but to withdraw from these proceedings, unless and until the board, on further consideration, should decide that under the peculiar circumstances of this case ability to pay is not a proper factor for its consideration."

The company's reasons for this stand were five: (1) inability to pay has not been pleaded as a reason for rejecting the union's demands; (2) "The question of profits and prices for the future . . . involves judgment by those familiar with the business, and that judgment is in the minds of men, not in books and documents"; (3) It is up to the O.P.A. alone to consider the question of profits and prices; (4) Any information given the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

board would have to remain confidential, which would not inspire confidence in the minds of the contending parties; and (5), "To yield to the demand of the union would mean the end of free enterprise. If our system of free enterprise . . . is to be abandoned, it must be by act of Congress, not by act of General Motors Corporation."

On this righteous note G.M. left the board, which refused to retreat from its position. The afternoon session opened with U.A.W. and board members looking at the empty G.M. seats. The board's recommendations will have been compiled from information given it by the union and from what corporation material is available in other government agencies such as the O.P.A., the R.F.C. and the S.E.C.

Some observers have been predicting a settlement of the strike by early February. It is hard to tell how much wishful thinking and how much hard logic enter into this prediction. Two developments on the automotive scene, however, indicate that the solid front of management has been at least dented. The amicable relations between the U.A.W. and the Ford company, and the granting by the union to the company of evidences of union responsibility for wild-cat strikes, point to a possible solution of that dispute by collective bargaining. And on January 8 the U.A.W. signed a contract with the Kaiser-Fraser Corporation, a newcomer in the automobile field. The contract, hailed by union leaders as "unquestionably the best ever reached with an automobile company," provided that the company (1) would base wage scales on the prevailing rates at the Ford Motor Company's Rouge plant, reported to be the biggest in the industry; (2) meet any increases granted by General Motors, and (3) set up a pool by laying aside $5 for each car produced during the year at the Willow Run plant. The pool is to be divided among Kaiser-Fraser production workers at the end of the year. Any worker participating in a work stoppage not authorized by the U.A.W. is to lose bonus benefits for the period of participation. Also provided in the contract is a union shop, check-off of dues, and, in the opinion of both labor and management, the "most favorable" veterans' clause yet drawn up.

STEEL AND MEAT

On two other strike fronts the ball was neatly passed to the O.P.A., which was in the position of being damned if it didn't and damned if it did. Both the steel and the meat industries made it plain that they would not grant any wage increases unless they obtain a substantial price increase. Price Administrator Bowles is reported to have told President Truman on January 8 that the O.P.A. could only recommend a price increase of $2.50 per ton of steel rather than the $7 increase demanded by the company to meet what it considers past price deficiencies and future wage increases. The Chief Executive admitted that steel prices will be increased, and government circles rumor that it will be by as much as $4 per ton. January 14 was set as D-Day in the steel industry, and the fact-finding board

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studying this dispute worked against time. The panel, beginning its inquiry on January 5, staved off a decision on the question of examining company books by requesting both U. S. Steel and the union to try again to settle their differences by collective bargaining. The board, required to report by February 10, has requested the President to grant it authority to study a large cross-section of the steel industry rather than confining itself solely to one giant corporation.

The A.F.L. and C.I.O. appeared to have joined hands in the meat packers dispute, with 135,000 A.F.L. members promising to help 200,000 C.I.O. packers in the threatened walk-out on January 16. Administration circles have been discussing a possible increase in the amount paid by the government for its meat while keeping civilian prices down. If no solution is reached the American family faces a diet of Spam and fish.

NONE FOR ME, THANKS

"When we turn to our domestic problems, we do not find a similar record of achievement and progress in the Congress."

Thus did President Truman sum up the relation between Capitol Hill and the White House. Like his predecessor, he appealed to the people over the head of Congress to put the heat on their representatives to enact his program. Foremost on his list of "musts" was his proposal for fact-finding boards.

Mr. Truman sounded hurt that his plan had the dubious distinction of uniting both labor and management in opposition. It is clear that Congress will not give the President the labor legislation he desires. Whether he will get nothing while Congress plays a "hands-off" game, or whether Congress will enact restrictive labor measures, depends upon both the strength of the lobbies turning the heat on Congress and the nearness of the congressional elections.

In addition to legislation to alleviate strikes, Mr. Truman requested for the umpteenth time extension of the price control act, slated to expire June 30, 1946, a year's extension of the Second War Powers Act, which Congress extended until June 30, 1946, full employment legislation, increased unemployment insurance and minimum wages, the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee, comprehensive scientific research, universal training, an adequate salary scale for federal employees and passage of his presidential succession bill.

The lack of congressional action upon these measures appeared to bother the Chief Executive more than their possible rejection. He seemingly wished that Congress would make up its mind one way or another. "If the measures which I have recommended . . . do not meet the approval of the Congress, it is my fervent wish . . . that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of the Congress. What the American people want is action."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE DIG, DIG, DIG

There were many congressmen, however, who questioned whether the American people wanted the type of action recommended by the administration. Senator Taft, arch Republican from Ohio, termed parts of the Truman program "communist" and "left wing," and said that "Congress ought to get credit for a little delay."

Congress appeared to feel that the easiest way to delay legislative action was to turn its attention to investigations. Many of these, like the Elliot Roosevelt debt controversy and the Hurley charges against the State Department, fizzled out in short order. Without doubt, the Pearl Harbor investigating committee has enjoyed the longest Washington run.

Its very length, however, has led it into hot water. The chief of counsel, William Mitchell, announced on December 14 his impending resignation and that of many of his staff. His patience finally exhausted because of the delaying tactics used by certain members of the committee, Mitchell said that "extensive examination" and repetitious and irrelevant questions had created a situation where, after a month of testimony, only eight of 68 witnesses had been heard. The final straw for Mitchell apparently came after Republican members of the committee cross-examined General Marshall for seven days while a plane waited to carry him to Chungking on his new mission as Ambassador to China. Senator Ferguson alone took up nine and a half hours in cross-examining the former chief of staff.

As the Christmas recess neared, the House and Senate extended the life of the committee from January 3 to February 15. By the end of the year the record totaled 700,000 words. Its length by February will be at least twice this long.

To replace William Mitchell, the committee selected Seth Richardson, a Washington attorney and like his predecessor a Republican. By mid-January the investigators had ended the "Washington" phase of the investigation and prepared, with the testimony of Kimmel and Short, to focus their light upon the Pearl Harbor locale. It seemed agreed that after the testimony of these two Hawaiian commanders, the inquiry would reach an anti-climax, with 50-odd witnesses yet to testify. About 15 of these are scheduled to report on the disputed "wind message."

The committee's disclosures have thus far been more amplifying than new. The first part of the inquiry resulted in a sustained attack by the Republican committee members on the foreign policies of the administration, especially upon the advisability of basing the fleet at Pearl Harbor. With the exception of Admiral Richardson, however, all the witnesses seemed agreed that this action was a deterrent to the Japanese.

The witnesses have been more divided on the responsibility of Kimmel and Short. Both Marshall and Stark, however, asserted that everything known in Washington was deliberately and properly not sent to Pearl Harbor, lest it merely confuse the field commanders, but that the various

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warnings which were dispatched to the Pacific, and particularly those of command as opposed to mere information, were adequate to force a state of preparedness which failed to materialize.

For the first time in five years, the accused present their case before the American public. Whether sensational and vital information would be obtained, or whether the testimony would be just another case of buck-passing, was anybody's guess.

APARTMENT DESIRED

"The government is determined to give private enterprise every encouragement and assistance to see that the houses are produced— and produced fast. Where private enterprise is unable to provide the necessary housing, it becomes the responsibility of the government to do so. But it is primarily a job for private enterprise to do—a job which is a challenge as stimulating as any goal we set during the war."

Never before in the nation's history has the question of shelter, any sort of shelter, been as pressing as it is in 1946. Part of the acute shortage can be laid to the cessation of private building during the war. More fundamentally, however, the lack of adequate facilities has been creeping up on the country for the last 50 years. We now are in desperate need of 5,000,000 dwellings, and no short-term solution is possible. Regardless of what action is taken, either by Congress or the administration, there is no way to make a roof retroactive.

President Truman took steps to alleviate a situation which found every major city packed to the gills and has forced more than a million families to double up. The real estate and construction pressure groups, among the strongest Washington lobbies, forced the lifting of government construction controls. As a result, most of the available labor and material were going into industrial building. Reconversion Director Snyder admitted that he was wrong in giving the industry its head and asked that his policy be reversed.

In December the President disclosed plans to revive the abandoned system of priority control on building materials so that they would be channelled into new low-cost residential building. His three-point program called for immediate release of surplus housing and materials held by the federal government, priorities for low-priced dwellings, and legislative price ceilings on the sale of old and new shelters. His plan to channel 50 per cent of the available material into the building of houses costing $10,000 or less met the united opposition of the nation's real estate boards and construction men. There was also little indication that Congress would put ceilings on roofs.

Civilian Production Administrator Small disclosed that by January 15 the administration's program to provide at least 400,000 houses of moderate cost for veterans will get under way. This program, however, depends upon the use of priorities, and unless congressional action is forthcoming, the administration's authority in this field ends in June. In any event, it will be 10 years before the housing supply equals the demand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM FEATURES

The article by **Theodore M. Greene** is the second of a series on the rôle of education in our society. In the first one, "What Is the Matter with Us?" (FORUM, January, 1946), he discusses the age-old problem of mankind: "How can we keep ourselves from destroying ourselves?" In this issue Mr. Greene goes on to say that only the school and the church have inner cultural and spiritual resources and that the state and the family are both derivative and secondary. And in the March issue, he plans to examine his above observation more closely, particularly in connection with the church and the school.

Ferdinand A. Hermens left Germany in September, 1934, with the hope "that something could be done to provide a sound constitutional basis for the reconstruction of democracy in Europe, which would sometime have to follow the inevitable domination of Nazi tyranny". Now Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, he has written **Democracy or Anarchy?: A Study of Proportional Representation** (1941) and **The Tyrant's War and the People's Peace** (1944).

The first part of **Kingsley Davis'** article on the trend of world population appeared in the January issue of FORUM. He completed his discussion of the subject in this issue.

Like most newspaper men, **Royce Brier** drifted into his career. Once in, though, he stayed. For the past 25 years he has been on the staff of **The San Francisco Chronicle**, where as a reporter, he won the Pulitzer Prize in 1934. After two trips around the world and a year in Europe, Mr. Brier was assigned to write a page one column on world affairs. This was in 1937. Since then, in addition to his column, he has been made director of editorials on **The Chronicle.** On the side, Mr. Brier has had several novels published and, some time in 1946, plans to publish a non-fiction study of Western civilization.

Both sides of the FORUM were written by educational consultants. **Charlotte C. Pardee,** who argued that schools are responsible for American illiteracy, received her training as a teacher in both public and private schools and now specializes in remedial work, particularly in and around New York. On the other hand, **Helen Faust,** who laid the responsibility for illiteracy on the community, was formerly Assistant Dean of Women at Pennsylvania State College. She is now a counselor in the Philadelphia school system.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED